School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1377285

The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

Mobilising For Peace

DDRESSES DELIVERED AT THE CONGRESS ON AMERICA AND THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE

EDITED BY
FREDERICK LYNCH, D.D.
Educational Secretary, World Alliance for International Friendship

JX
1937
L8

NEW YORK CHICAGO
Fleming H. Revell Company
LONDON AND EDINBURGH

Copyright, 1924, by
FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

New York: 158 Fifth Avenue
Chicago: 17 North Wabash Ave.
London: 21 Paternoster Square
Edinburgh: 75 Princes Street

RIVERSIDE FIRST METHODIST

FOREWORD

THE following pages are the expression of many minds, but there is a surprising unanimity running through them all. The chapters were written absolutely independent of one another, but they all emphasise three or four fundamental truths. There is first of all the feeling that war is utterly and absolutely unchristian, contradicting everything for which Christianity stands, and that it is also an anachronism in our modern civilisation. Secondly, there is a feeling that there cannot be two contradictory moralities or ethics in any real civilisation, one for individuals and another for governments, Christian for man, pagan for nations. The time has come when nations must base their ideals and relationships on that same Christian principle that governs the relations of gentlemen. Thirdly, there is an expression in all of these chapters that the only way a Christian order for the world, where security, justice and peace shall reign, can be achieved is that by which individuals have attained theirs, namely by organisation into some form of community life. Peace has come to the groups within the nations by the sinking of individualism in the common life. There is no other path for nations except by the sinking of extreme nationalism in some form of international community. Most of the writers believe that the League of Nations is the most promising experiment in the community life of nations that the world has as yet achieved. All of them accept the World Court as a step in this direction. Finally, all

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
CALIFORNIA
A5698

of these writers earnestly hold that America should heartily associate herself in the endeavour to realise the family of nations, and that by her aloofness from these endeavours to realise some form of the common life she is greatly retarding the progress toward lasting peace.

Some of the writers concern themselves with the fundamental principles upon which a stable, peaceful world order must rest; most of them deal directly with the nature of the experiments toward world peace that are now being tried, and the part America should have in them. All are agreed that America should either join the present League of Nations, perhaps with some changes on which all nations could agree, or suggest something better to take its place. Every writer here represented, and they are very representative of every walk in life, is emphatically of the opinion that the doctrine of isolation is not only selfish but contrary to the whole course of American tradition and policy. Furthermore, no nation can live to itself alone any more than can a man.

Every one of our writers urge America's entrance into the World Court. It is an ideal that America has always fathered. Her great statesmen have all urged it upon the world. She has had large part in its immediate inception and the shaping of its constitution. It commits her to nothing except its support. There is no reason she should remain outside of it except a stubborn resolution to have nothing to do with the rest of the world, and an unchristian determination to be sole judge of her own actions—a position which, held by an individual, places him outside the ranks of his fellow-men.

These utterances, by leaders of the Church, distinguished educators, statesmen and publicists, come to the

reader with added weight because of the endorsement of some five hundred outstanding American citizens. They were all read at the Congress on America and the Permanent Court of International Justice, called by the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches, November 13-15, 1923, at Philadelphia. They constituted one of the most representative groups ever assembled in America. At the closing session they unanimously expressed their general agreement with the utterances herein recorded, in the statement printed on page 306, which I confidently believe voices the common conscience of the Christian forces of America.

FREDERICK LYNCH.

New York.

Contents

PART I

ESSENTIALS

I. Mobilising for Peace 17
William P. Merrill, D.D.,
President, World Alliance; Pastor, Brick Presbyterian Church, New York.

II. The Basis of Mobilisation . . . 30
Charles E. Jefferson, D.D.,
Member, Executive Committee, World Alliance; Pastor, Broadway Tabernacle, New York.

III. Organising Our Expectations . . 39
William Adams Brown, D.D.,
Roosevelt Professor, Systematic Theology, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

IV. Christ or Mars * 52
Will Irwin,
War Correspondent; Author, "The Next War," etc.

V. A Valid Christianity 66
William E. Sweet,
Governor of Colorado.

VI. The Senator and the Citizen . . 76
Harriet B. Laidlaw,
Vice-Chairman, Women's Pro-League Council; Chairman, Welfare Committee, New York League of Women Voters.

* A book by Mr. Irwin bearing this title, was recently published by D. Appleton & Co.

VII. The People and World Peace . . 83
Edward L. Beach,
U. S. Navy, Retired; Commandant, Mare Island Navy Station, during the War; Lecturer, Leland Stanford University.

VIII. Effective Community Action . . 94
Jacob Goldstein,
Temple Anshé Emeth, New Brunswick, N. J.; Organiser, New Brunswick Council World Alliance.

PART II

INSTRUMENTS

IX. A Constructive Program . . . 101
Mary E. Woolley,
President, Mount Holyoke College, Mass.

X. A World Economic Conference . 110
Oscar Straus,
Formerly U. S. Ambassador to Turkey; Secretary, Commerce and Labour in the Cabinet of President Roosevelt; formerly member, Permanent Court of Arbitration at the Hague.

XI. A World Court—Need and Purpose 116
A. Lawrence Lowell, LL.D.,
President, Harvard University.

XII. The World Court—Method and Application 125
Manley O. Hudson,
Professor, International Law, Harvard University; Member, Executive Committee League of Nations Non-Partisan Association; Member, Legal Section Secretariat League of Nations.

XIII. The Working League of Nations . 138
Fridtjof Nansen, Ph.D.,
Arctic Explorer; Author; Director, Humanitarian Work under the League of Nations.

XIV. The Humanitarian League of Nations 162
Raymond B. Fosdick,
Formerly Under-Secretary, League of Nations; Member, Executive Committee League of Nations Non-Partisan Association; Trustee, Rockefeller Foundation.

XV. America's Relief Measures . . 166
James Cannon, Jr., D.D.,
Bishop, Methodist Episcopal Church, South; Director, World Alliance.

XVI. England's Church Movements for Peace 179
Thomas Nightingale,
General Secretary, National Free Church Council of England and Wales.

XVII. Co-operative Action and World Peace 188
Fred B. Smith,
Chairman, Commission on Councils of Churches of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America.

XVIII. World Interdependence . . . 199
Alice L. Parsons,
New York State President, American Association of University Women; Secretary, New York State League of Women Voters.

PART III

CO-OPERATION ACROSS NATIONAL BORDERS

XIX. A Message from England . . . 207
T. G. Brierley Kay,
Rector, Christ Church, Marylebone, London; Secretary, British Council for Interchange of Preachers and Speakers.

XX. A Message from Canada . . . 210
Arthur G. Dorland,
Professor, Western University, London, Ontario.

XXI. A Message from France . . . 216
Jules Jézequel,
General Secretary, National Union of Reformed Churches of France; Honorary Secretary, French Committee of the World Alliance; Member, Council of the French Federation of the Associations for the League of Nations.

XXII. A Message from Germany . . . 221
Otto Wiedfeldt,
German Ambassador to the United States.

XXIII. A Message from Hungary . . . 222
Géza Takaro,
Pastor, First Magyar Reformed Church of New York; formerly Secretary, Hungarian Council World Alliance.

XXIV. A Message from Jerusalem . . . 228
Panteleimon Athanassiades,
Archbishop, Plenipotentiary Representative of the Patriarch of Jerusalem in the Movement to Preserve the Sacred Places in the Holy Land.

XXV. A Message from Sweden . . . 233
Nathan Soederblom, D.D.,
Archbishop of Upsala; Primate of the Church of Sweden (Lutheran).

XXVI. A Message from China 247
Y. Y. Tsu, Ph.D.,
General Secretary, Chinese Students' Christian Association of North America.

XXVII. A Message from Japan 249
Tadakazu Uwoki,
Japanese Student in the United States.

XXVIII. A Message from Mexico . . . 253
Herbert M. Sein,
Mexican Student in the United States.

XXIX. A Message from Switzerland . . 261
Andre Bouvier,
Swiss Student in the United States.

XXX. Response to the Messages . . . 264
Peter Ainslie, D.D.,
Pastor, Christian Temple, Baltimore, Md.

APPENDIX

1. Report of the General Secretary . . 273
Henry A. Atkinson, D.D.

2. Report of Educational Secretary . . 282
Frederick Lynch, D.D.

3. Report of Secretary on Oriental Relations 286
Sidney L. Gulick, D.D.

4. Report on International Friendship Through the Churches 291
E. W. Scott, U. S. N.
Official Representative from Navy Department.

5. Report on Service to Migrating People Through the World Alliance . . . 294
Raymond E. Cole.
Special Worker for Follow-up of New Americans, Home Missions Council.

6. Resolutions and Statement 301

7. World Organisation 313
Officers and Directors.

PART I

ESSENTIALS

I

MOBILISING FOR PEACE

WILLIAM PIERSON MERRILL, D.D.,

President, World Alliance; Pastor, Brick Presbyterian Church, New York.

THAT is a strong word, "mobilising." It means more than action; more than concerted action; more than rallying forces for a stroke at a certain time. The image in it is very clear and concrete. The phrase reveals the very point at which our efforts and programs for peace have broken down. We have talked peace; we have sung peace; we have planned peace; we have worked and prayed for peace. We have not *mobilised* for peace.

Back in the days when arguments were being urged for and against military preparedness, a well known popular orator declared that were America threatened "a million men would spring to arms in her defense between sunrise and sunset." Apparently he thought that was all that would be necessary. That is not mobilisation. That word "mobilise" is not derived from the word "mob."

No one who was in France, or Germany, or Belgium, or England, in July and August, 1914, needs to be told

that "mobilising" involves more than springing to arms. It involves putting into operation a prearranged plan. Mobilisation has in it at least four well-defined elements:

The first is *drill and education beforehand.* Each soldier comes not *asking* what to do, but *knowing* what to do, and how to do it. Every man finds his preassigned place. For years patient drill has been going on, by which the forces have been trained and made ready for action when the time shall come.

What would it mean for the churches of America, and the men and women of goodwill generally, to *mobilise* for peace? It would mean a long, patient, thoroughly organised drill, education as to facts of war and peace, preparation on a wide scale for right participation in the fight for peace.

It would mean going into schools and Sunday schools, into homes and churches, with patient, slow, growing educational processes, aims and programs; to the end that in time there might be in this land a mighty host of men and women equipped to handle rightly this tremendous problem of war and peace, acquainted with the facts, familiar with the history and the principles of the movement for peace, knowing what to do and how to do it.

That work is not being done. Only faint and sporadic attempts have been made. The great commissions on peace of our various religious organisations ought to see this as their chief opportunity and task. There has been too much public talk and too little private training; too many concerted discussions and too little concerted study; too many voices crying in the wilderness, too few patient teachers of children and youth; too much agitation, too

little inculcation. To mobilise for peace would mean setting adequate forces at work to produce the slow but sure formation of right public opinion on war and peace.

The second element in real mobilisation is *Division and Correlation of functions and responsibilities.*

Each regiment, each corps, each division, knows where to go and what to do. That is mobilisation. That is not what has been done in the work for peace. Imagine that when the regiments came to report in France or Germany if the war authorities had met them with a benevolent smile and said, "You know in general how to use your weapons; you know in general where the enemy is. God bless you, go on and shoot!" That would have meant not mobilisation, but demoralisation. But is not that about what we have been doing in peace efforts? Countless societies, unions, leagues, commissions, alliances, corporations, associations, for peace or against war, each acting independently, each trying to cover all the field, each shooting at the common foe in its own way, each getting in the others' way, each occasionally hit by the fire of the others. Once again, *mob*-ilisation, not *mo*-bilisation. Mobilisation demands a general staff. There ought to be a general staff of the peace movement in America. Whence shall its authority be derived? Who shall appoint it? How can functions and responsibilities be rightly divided? I do not know. But we may all rejoice in the fact that two leading organisations for peace, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, and the American Section of the World Alliance, which have too long and too far been working independently of each other, are seriously trying to work out a real plan for effective co-operation; and I

know I voice the general sentiment of the men and women of the World Alliance when I say, to all agencies working in this field, " we stand ready to go to the limit in the attempt to adjust programs, combine efforts, divide responsibilities and assign functions, to the end that our efforts for peace may be more unified and effective."

The third element in real mobilising is the providing of unstinted resources.

We must have not only the " million men springing to arms "; we must have arms for them to spring to. We must have large resources, adequate for the work that must be done. A nation which faced war with its armies levied and assembled, but with no understanding with banks and factories, would be beaten in a few days. Mobilisation means knowing whence the money and materials are to come.

Have the churches, or the American people as a whole, ever mobilised for peace? Some of the most ambitious and active movements for peace have to spend much of their time getting together funds and must plan their work and their publications with an eye to their use as advertising media and money-getters. Somehow money must be available for peace as it is for war.

Nor does this apply only to voluntary contributions. We ought to demand that governments be as ready to spend money in the interests of peace as they are in the interests of war.

Suppose that all over the world one-tenth part, or one-hundredth part of the energy and determination, the expenditure and sacrifice, that went to the making of war had gone for the making of peace. Would we not have peace now instead of a mere armistice? Why

should we assume that nations may spend millions for defence, but not one cent for friendship? How is it that we can spend billions in making war, but cannot even consider any adjustment of the indebtedness of other nations to us, no matter how essential it is to the order and peace of the world? Why is it that constitutions and laws make it so easy to spend money for war, and so hard to spend it for peace? We need to change the emphasis; to make governments no less than individuals give unstintedly for the encouragement and maintenance of peace.

But the immediate concern is that churches and individuals shall play their part in a real mobilising movement by providing resources not so indecently inadequate as those at present available. Men ought to support the peace movement somewhat as they bought Liberty Bonds.

The fourth element in real mobilisation is the dropping of all minor interests.

That is what mobilisation means. Men let go other matters, even important matters, to take hold with both hands on that which makes for victory. How we forgot differences, merged interests, subordinated all private or group advantage, that we might all make war. We ought now to ignore differences, merge interests, subordinate private and group advantage, that we may all make peace.

Something like that we must do if we are to *mobilise* for peace.

There is a great saying in the Bible:—that book which most of us avow to be our divinely inspired guide, but which we so easily ignore when it commands inconvenient things—"Seek peace and *pursue* it." That little verse lays its hand on the weak point in the

fight for peace. We have dreamed peace and talked about it. We have planned peace and then picked flaws in the plans. We have not *pursued* peace. We have not *made* peace as we *made* war. We have not built the machinery of peace as we eagerly and at staggering cost built the enginery of war.

When war came we dropped everything else and pursued it. When peace drew near we said, "Let her come," and went about our business. If we want peace we must go after it as a falcon pursues a dove, never letting up until we have secured it.

That is a great word, "pursue." It is more than a military word. When we speak of some business or profession or art as a man's or woman's "pursuit" we mean that it is no side-issue in their lives, but a major interest or even a maximum interest. There is always a strong hint of earnestness, abandon, real live attention about the word "pursue."

Now, one great trouble is that we have not pursued peace. We have sat and waited for it; we have stood up and sung about it; we have knelt down and prayed for it. We have denounced war; we have apostrophised peace. But we have not pursued it, keeping on its trail until it is ours. We have pursued it only in that scatter-brained fashion in which the Bellman and his companions hunted the Snark.

We have made the cause of Peace a fad rather than a pursuit. The essence of the fad is temporary interest in an end we want; the essence of the pursuit is untiring growth in mastery of the means to the end.

The American people have this as one of their chief defects—they take to fads rather than to pursuits. They talk and sing about ideals and hopes; but they hate to take the steps necessary to reach the goal they

talk about so fervently. The American people have wanted peace; they have not pursued it.

When will nations and governments pursue peace as they pursue war, get ready for peace as they get ready for war, make peace as they make war? In the pursuit of war, governments stop at nothing. In the pursuit of peace, they stop at anything. In war we forget old jealousies, distrust of other nations and races, and motives of self-interest, in the pursuit of the common cause; but no motive is too small, no plea of self-interest too ignoble, no jealousy too ill-founded to be urged as sufficient reason for staying out of the co-operative pursuit of peace. Peace must pursue the governments, convince and convert them. If once they would pursue peace as they pursue war we would have peace that would last as long as the moon endures.

All this may sound very general and rather remote. What can each of us individually do to help mobilise for peace?

Four specific things we can do; if we all do them it will mean much.

The first thing you and I and everyone can do is to know and keep making known the facts about war.

Nothing should stop us in this work. One grave danger threatening mankind is that a new generation will come up trained and accustomed to look back on this war, as men have always looked back on war from a distance, as a glorious and wonderful affair. We must not let the sense of the hideous gruesomeness of the horrible business of fighting fade out. The best of our fighting men came back with their lips sealed. They would not talk about war. Can we wonder? Yet they ought to talk. They ought never to let anyone

forget what war is, as waged today. We ought to read and pass on and keep in circulation such books as Will Irwin and Philip Gibbs and others have been writing. Strong influences are at work to suppress or set aside such discussions of the nature of war; they tell us we must not tell these facts or we can get no men to enlist in our army and navy. Well, if men can be got into our army and navy only by misrepresenting war and what it means it is too high a price to pay. Tell the truth, the whole truth about the savage, beastly, devilish conditions of modern war. To do less is to play false to the cause of peace.

One of the facts that heartens us is that some of the best men in our army and navy are telling the truth and facing the facts. Some of the most effective and wise pleas against war and for peace, it has ever been my privilege to hear, have come from officers high in the military and naval service of our nation. Every Christian, every lover of peace, should put real thought and energy into the task of keeping unveiled that grim horror of this business of war. It was a stern fighter who said, "War is *Hell!*" and no one has any business trying to make people believe that after all hell is not so very bad.

A second part of the pursuit of peace for every one of us is in bearing untiring witness against the ever-recurring falsehood that "war is inevitable," that man is by nature a fighting animal, and that therefore peace is an idle dream.

Twice, during the past few days, that false doctrine has thrust itself into prominence. In a French town a monument had been erected to the men who died in the Great War. On it were the words, "Guerre à la Guerre,"—French equivalent of our slogan, "a war to

end war." The inscription was ordered removed as unpatriotic. A distinguished British jurist gave a rectorial address at a Scotch University in which he called war inevitable, repeated the statement that "man is a fighting animal," and declared that self-interest and not idealism should guide nations.

We abhor and reject such statements as unworthy of men who believe in God. Of course, man is by nature a fighting animal; but so he is by nature a lustful animal, a slave-holding animal, a self-seeking animal. But must he *stay* so? Must he go on along the low level?

The fact that man is a fighting animal no more means that he will always fight than the fact that he is an ignorant animal means that he will always remain ignorant, or the fact that he has powerful impulses and appetites means that he will always be drunken and gluttonous and unchaste. In the name of God, and of Jesus Christ, why are we here if not to overcome the lower nature and bring it into captivity, to the obedience of Christ?

No Christian ought to hear it said that "war is inevitable," without taking the first and best opportunity to nail it as a lie. No evil is inevitable; nothing wrong need continue. This is God's world, and nothing is to be taken as permanent that is not right.

The third way in which we can join in the pursuit of peace is in helping to remove the causes of war.

We have been too ready to think it enough to inveigh against war. That we must do; but that is not enough. Men and nations fight not because they want to fight, but because war has in the particular case become unavoidable, through the outworking of certain causes. No one who was in Britain in early August of 1914 can doubt that that nation went into the war with a

heavy heart and against its will. The causes lay far back; they always do. To pursue peace is to get back to those causes and remove them.

War is like disease. It does some good to warn against dread diseases, and keep people awake to the danger of them. But to eradicate disease, find the causes and deal with them, rather than with the symptoms. This is the fault I find with the pacifist. Many are belaboring him, most of them because they say he goes too far. I find fault with him in that he does not go far enough. He talks of war as if it were an isolated thing, something you could deal with "in itself," the simple remedy being to abstain from it. There is value in such a crusade. But it is too much like saying in the presence of a plague, "this plague is horrible, ghastly. Have nothing to do with it." The only way to deal with this disease of war is to get back to the causes and eliminate them.

Study about them; become intelligent; come to see the intimate connection between war and economic conditions; estimate the effect of race feeling and overwrought nationalism and other causes on the bringing about of war. Encourage the agencies that make for better understanding of the underlying causes of war. That is one of the open ways for the pursuit of peace.

The fourth clear way of participation in the pursuit of peace is through urging the taking of such practical steps as are immediately possible.

Here is where we have failed. There is no use in reviving old controversies. It is possible to argue that those were right who kept America out of the League of Nations. But those were wrong who merely kept us out of that and offered nothing else for us to be in! There are steps which ought to be taken now, things

which might be done. We should insist upon those things.

One of them is the World Court. No good argument has been urged against American participation in it. Yet the matter hangs fire; there is no prospect of decisive action. Every American Christian ought to look into that matter; if he believes that our country ought to participate in the World Court he should use every ounce of influence he possesses to get the government to take the necessary steps. Here is something tangible and definite.

Again, we should exert our utmost powers to get and keep goodwill between our country and other nations, most of all just now between the United States and Great Britain.

I say this not as a partisan of Great Britain, but as a lover of peace. The reasons for holding America and Great Britain close together just now are so weighty that any American, whether he be of Anglo-Saxon, or French, or German, or whatever ancestry, should give his best to that cause. These are the two nations which came out from the war with strength least impaired. They have a common language, common institutions, common traditions. Great Britain is the only world power with a large and growing part of her empire on this continent.

We are both interested in the sea and its trade as few other people are. These are plain facts and they make clear our duty to stand strongly for all that makes for cordial relations with that great empire.

But we must stand for the largest and fullest possible co-operation with all nations. We must do our utmost to encourage and foster goodwill among races and peoples. These are perfectly definite ends, which we

can pursue along perfectly clear paths. Every one of us should make such pursuit of peace one of his major interests.

Other ways will be found if we really make peace our pursuit and not merely our fad. One ingenious man has recently found a way to set people thinking and planning for world peace by offering a large prize for the best plan. It is Mr. Bok's own way, but it has had an immediate and strong effect, which ought to encourage others to cease patronising peace and to begin the pursuit of peace, along ways of their own.

One thing above all we can do, stand for the integrating and against the disintegrating forces in our national, social, industrial and church life. We can always be on the side of that which unifies, and against that which divides. We can be a part of that which holds the church together, the nation together, the world together. Especially should all good churchmen and churchwomen set themselves to make the church a united and unifying force. Strong divisive forces are at work in the church. We must strengthen the constructive, comprehensive, unifying forces. We must do all we can to get the labourers in the Lord's vineyard to spend less time building and repairing doctrinal fences and more time raising the fruits of the spirit. There are too many vineyards that are all walls and no vines. We might well make it our motto: "Fruits, rather than fences." A church not big enough, not religious enough to be at peace within itself cannot help the cause of peace and goodwill on earth.

"Blessed are the peacemakers," said One before whom we all bow in reverence, "for they shall be called sons of God." Those who make anything good are akin to God, the Maker of heaven and earth.

But we need to learn anew how God makes things. It is hard work to make anything worth while. We have just begun to learn that God is making the world by hard work. In the brilliant and wonderful light of the principle of evolution, we see no longer an easy-going deity, sitting on a throne and making worlds swing into being by some magic word, or wave of the sceptre, as a child blows soap bubbles. We see a God at work "in the mud and scum of things," the God Jesus saw when He said, "My Father works even until now, and I work."

We have tried to make peace as simpler folk thought God made the world: "Let us have peace." It does not come that way. We must make peace with the infinite patience, the infinite sacrifice, with which God is making His world, leading stubborn stuff into forms of beauty and use.

Mobilising for peace, pursuing peace, making peace —that is what we must do. Only such a spirit in all of us will ever bring that great end of peace and good-will on earth.

Too long we have been fooling with peace. It is time to say to ourselves and to one another,

"Come, now, let us cast off fooling,
And put by ease and rest;
For the cause alone is worthy,
Till the good days bring the best,
Ah, come, cast off all fooling;
For this at least we know,
That the dawn and the day are coming,
And forth the banners go!"

II

THE BASIS OF MOBILISATION

CHARLES E. JEFFERSON, D.D.,

Pastor, Broadway Tabernacle, New York.

I HAVE been asked to be a "Fundamentalist" this afternoon, a Fundamentalist in the sense that I shall deal with the things that lie at the foundation. I have been asked to strike a note at the very beginning of our Congress which shall go sounding on through all the sessions of it. I think I cannot do better than unfold an idea which St. Paul expressed in his First Letter to the Corinthians in these words: "Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ." Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is a man—a particular type of man. Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is a man of a unique personality known in history as Jesus Christ. Other foundation of a conquering church can no man lay than that. Other foundation of a prosperous nation can no man lay, and other foundation of an enduring civilisation can no man lay, than Jesus Christ.

The Church in Corinth had fallen on troubled days. Paul had preached Jesus Christ as the ideal man, the rock on which the whole edifice must be built. But other types of character have emerged. The sensual man has come to the front, causing scandal by his appetites and passions. He always causes trouble whenever

he appears. The bumptious man has arrived, causing commotion by his vanity and his strutting egotism. The partisan man has exhibited himself—the man who blocks progress by his shortsightedness—the man who sees so clearly a part that he is blind to the claims of the whole. The selfish man becomes prominent, introducing discord by his pettiness and greed. The church is gradually falling to pieces, all because men have forgotten the ideal. The church is demoralised—its corporate life is enfeebled. The Christian Community is in imminent danger of disintegration, and Paul comes to the rescue with his remedy: "Other foundation can no man lay that that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ."

The Great War has made us more heedful of foundations. Before the war we were recklessly superficial. We looked at the surface and were content. We cleansed the outside of the cup and the platter, and were not very much interested in what lay inside. Our machinery was elaborate, and our program was splendid. We possessed boundless knowledge, and we had built up a civilisation which glittered. We swept out of the nineteenth century into the twentieth with all the bands playing, and with the air all aflutter with our victorious banners. We listened to the voluble sophists who talked to us about insurance. "Vast armaments were insurance—they cost a deal of money—hundreds of millions of dollars a year. But insurance is always costly, and it pays." That is what the sophists all said, and we believed them. Guns and ships were a guarantee of peace. The war machine was in perfect working order. No such machine had ever been created by the genius of man. We had bought security at a fearful price, but we were saved. This is what the leaders assured us, and all at once in the twinkling of an eye,

we found the world sliding into the abyss. We discovered that we were not insured at all. The house burned up, and there was no one to make good our losses. In times of peace we had prepared for war, and what we had prepared for had come. Our eyes were opened to the meaning of words spoken in Galilee nineteen hundred years ago: "And every one that heareth these words of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, who built his house upon the sand." That is what we had done. We had built our civilisation on the sand, and when the winds blew and the floods came, the house fell.

There are those who cannot understand why the world is today, five years after the close of the war, in such a lamentable condition. They are amazed that things do not go on much as they went on before the flood overwhelmed us. They forget that the world is a wreck, and that we are little creatures crawling about the masses of debris, trying to work the chaos into order. When an express train goes down an embankment several hundred feet high, the locomotive is a complete wreck. Its delicate machinery is dislocated and broken, and the cars are masses of splintered wood and twisted steel. No one expects that workmen will get the train on the track and have it running on schedule time before the sun goes down. When a man falls into the hands of bandits, who strip him and beat him, tearing his muscles, breaking many of his bones, closing his eyes, fracturing his skull, and doing him internal injuries, the extent of which cannot be ascertained, we do not expect that man to be walking along the street with a smiling face before the end of the month. He will groan for many a month, and will hobble, it may be, for many a year. It is not the fault

of the surgeons and doctors and nurses, that he is not completely himself at the end of the season. Humanity fell into rough and brutal hands, and it will take many years to recover from the devastation of the great war. Generations must pass before its disastrous effects are obliterated. We built our civilisation on the wrong type of man—the man with the mailed fist, and the result was an immeasurable disaster.

The world now must be reconstructed, and it must be built on a different foundation. Do not listen to anybody who offers you a short and speedy cut into the promised land. The world is full of schemes—plausible and seductive, but beware of them. Every week we hear of some new device—some novel bit of machinery exploited, but let no one be deceived. The world cannot be saved by any device no matter how clever, nor by any piece of machinery no matter how elaborate. We can never have a world that will endure until we get a world built on the Jesus Christ type of man.

The industrial world is in a state of constant upheaval. Innumerable doctors have made a diagnosis of the complaint, and numberless inventors have submitted their schemes for establishing industrial peace. But peace there can never be until we get into industry the Jesus Christ type of man. The dominating man in the directors' room of the great corporation in the last fifty years has not been of the Jesus Christ type. There have been many good men in that room—men of large intelligence and noble purpose—more of them than many persons are willing to concede. But the dominant man on the board of directors—the man who has shaped the policy and dictated the capitalist program for the last fifty years, has not been a man of the Christ

type. Measure the distance between the actual type as seen in the dominant director, and the ideal type as seen in Jesus Christ, and you have the distance which must be travelled before we can have an abiding industrial peace. But the distance to be travelled is as great on one side as it is on the other. The dominant leader in the labour unions for the last fifty years has not been fashioned after the type of Jesus. There have been many high-minded and noble-hearted men in the labour unions, and these men must never be forgotten. But the man who has dictated the policy of the union has not been a man like Jesus. Measure the distance between the average labour leader and the Carpenter of Nazareth, and you have the distance which must be covered before the world shall arrive at industrial peace.

The nations today are in commotion. It is an age of revolution. There was a revolution in Russia, and another kind of revolution in Germany, and a revolution of still another type in Italy, and still another sort in Spain. There are those who believe that England will not escape before the present tempest has passed over. There are a few who think that this country may be swept at last by this tidal wave. But what is gained by revolution unless the dominant type of man has been changed? Some of us used to sympathise with Russia in her distresses. We rolled all the blame on the Czar, and if not on him, then on the grand dukes, and if not on them, then on the governmental system. We felt sure that if the government could be changed, or if it could be lodged in the hands of a new set of men, then Russia would roll out of the shadows of night, and it would be daybreak everywhere. But alas, we did not see the root of the trouble. The Czar is dead, and his grand dukes are dead, or driven into exile, and the sys-

tem of government has been changed, but the condition of Russia is most lamentable. Lenine is a radical who calls himself a leader, a reformer, a saviour, but he is a man of the old type. He is an autocrat, a despot—fully as despotic as the Czar ever was, and Russia remains in the gall of bitterness. Lenine is not the Christ type of man, and therefore nothing in Russia is secure. No matter what superstructure is erected on the ruins of the old monarchy it will come tumbling down unless Russia builds on another foundation. "Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ."

They are working out a new experiment in Ireland. Ireland is at last a Free State. For generations Ireland has been discontented and rebellious. It has filled the whole world with its groanings and curses. There have always been two opinions about Ireland. According to one opinion, the root of the trouble has been England. It is the fault of England that Ireland has suffered. It is the stupidity and cruelty of the English people which is responsible for the hell in Ireland. That is one view. The other view has been that the root of the trouble has been the character of the Irish people. The cause of the commotion has been a defect in the Irish soul. The secret of the tragedy is to be found in the disposition and vices of the Irish heart. We shall some day see which of the two theories is correct. The governmental system has been changed. England has taken her hands off. Ireland at last is free, and she now has a chance to demonstrate to all the world that the Irish character is strong enough, and the Irish heart is wise enough to build up a country which is orderly and prosperous and happy. Of one thing we are certain—there can be no permanent prosperity or enduring happiness in Ireland

unless Ireland builds on the one foundation. The Irishman must be a Christlike man.

The international world is in a state of confusion, and many ideas are afloat as to how the situation may be improved. The world is out of joint, and many earnest men are attempting to set it right. Many think that all would be well if there were only a League of Nations, and the United States were a member of it. I personally have always been a friend of the League, and have regretted that our own country did not go into it. But I do not share the optimistic views of some of my friends in regard to what would have happened if the United States had gone in. I do not think that we are in possession of such superlative wisdom that by contributing some of it the European problem would have been solved. I do not think that we have such supernatural strength as to be able to lift Europe's burden by the mere outreaching of our hand. I think that had we gone into the League the League would have done a more effective piece of work than it has been able to accomplish. But I am sure that no League of Nations, however constituted, can establish world peace unless we have the right type of man. The League of Nations is only a political device, and no political device can be made the foundation of an enduring civilisation. The League of Nations is only a machine, and its success depends largely on the men who run it. Everything depends at last upon the man. As Carlyle used to say—"Get your man and all is got." If you have the wrong type of man in the seats of power, then the League of Nations might prove a curse. It is only when the right man is in charge that you have any ground for expecting blessings out of any contrivance which men may invent.

Italy is a member of the League of Nations, and her Premier is a reformer, a leader, an emancipator—a man of tremendous energy and daring. We will not forget the wise things he has said, nor the good things he has done, nor can we soon forget what he did when he issued his ultimatum to Greece. It was the same sort of ultimatum which a group of fools in Vienna issued to Serbia in the year 1914. He told Greece seven things she had got to do—one of them must be done within five days—another one also must be completed within five days. An answer to his ultimatum had to be given inside of twenty-four hours. Every word was haughty, insolent, exasperating. Mussolini in that ultimatum showed himself to be a bully and a coward. A bully is a big man who browbeats and tramples on a little man. Italy is big and Greece is little, so Mussolini talks to her in language which is violent and insulting. He plays the coward. Greece is weak and poor—her own folly has brought her low, and so Mussolini talks to her in big, swelling words. He would never have dared to say such things to France or Great Britain or the United States. But because he has in him the heart of a coward he indulges in language which no true gentleman would use. He is a barbarian. We must not forget he is a dangerous man. He must be eliminated from the rulers of the world. He belongs to the old type of diplomat—the type that plunged Europe into hell. After writing his ultimatum, he told one of his admirals to take possession of Corfu, an island belonging to Greece. The brave admiral fired at it once, killing sixteen children. They were orphans. Their parents had been killed in a massacre, or had been starved to death in the desert. And now these little boys and girls were under the care

of the Near East Relief Commission. Five Italian men had been assassinated by unknown murderers on Greek soil, and therefore the Italian admiral will kill sixteen Greek children. That is war, silly, stupid, cruel, damnable. Mussolini is a man of the old school. He is not a pupil in the school of Christ. He will never get the world permanently forward. Other foundation can no man lay than the Christ type of manhood. The men of progress who do not know Christ invariably get the world into the ditch.

This brings us face to face with the supreme work of the Church—the building of the Christlike man. There are many who are impatient with the Church. They urge her to do this and that. And something else, and sometimes in order to escape criticism she attempts to do more things than lie within the scope of her commission. Sometimes men ask in bitter tones—what is the Church doing? They look here and there and yonder, and because she is not doing some specific task which they think she ought to do, they condemn her. But possibly she is doing the most important thing of all—building up men after the pattern of Christ. What is the best thing the Church can do for labour? Send into the labour world men who have the disposition of Jesus. What is the most important thing the Church can do for the nation? Bring up men with the ideal of Jesus in their hearts. What can the Church do to make this a better world—to put an end to war—and to make happy homes? Send out men and women in all directions filled with the spirit of Jesus. If you wish to build a house which will stand, there is only one foundation, and that is Jesus Christ.

III

ORGANISING OUR EXPECTATIONS

WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN, D.D.,

Professor, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

DR. JEFFERSON has been talking to us about our need of a new kind of leadership, a leadership which shall be Christian in fact as well as in name. "Too many of the men in responsible positions today," he tells us, "are imperialists in their philosophy." They appeal to selfishness and rely on force. Whether they call themselves Bolshevist, like Lenine, or Fascist, like Mussolini, they have lost faith in democratic methods. We need a new kind of leader, a man who trusts the good in people, who believes that we can do more by co-operation than by fighting, and is willing to take the risks of his faith; a leader who will take Christ for his model and make brotherhood his creed.

God knows, Dr. Jefferson is right. We do need such a leader. But in the meantime, while we are waiting for him, what are the rest of us to do? We who are gathered here are not heads of governments, but plain people doing our daily work as business men, teachers, preachers, citizens, homemakers. What can we do—indeed, is there anything that we can do—to hasten the coming of the leader we want and to make his work easier when he comes?

At first sight it might seem as if we could do little or

nothing. The obstacles seem so insuperable, the difficulties so appalling. Yet history shows that it is often darkest just before the dawn. Great men do not live in a vacuum; they are interpreters as well as creators. They express what many feel and execute what multitudes desire. Unless we do our part to get ready for him, our leader, when he comes, will be fatally handicapped.

What, then, I repeat, can we do to prepare the way for the leader we need? I can answer in a single word. We can organise our expectations. We can create the atmosphere which will make the peaceful adjustment of differences between nations seem possible. And we can do it intelligently, and on an international scale. That, as I understand it, is what this World Alliance is for. It is a piece of machinery which makes it possible for us to pool the existing fund of good will, to associate ourselves with those engaged in similar enterprises in other countries, and to direct the knowledge thus liberated into definite and practicable channels.

We have come here today to learn what progress we have thus far made in our enterprise, what obstacles we face and how we propose to go to work to overcome them.

What the obstacles are we know only too well. There is ignorance; we do not know the facts. There is prejudice; we are unwilling to see them when presented to us. There is self-interest; even when we do see the facts we see them from the angle of our private concerns. There is inertia; we are too lazy often to act on what we see. There is the increasing pace of modern life, the pressure of all the myriad influences which divert our attention from the longer future and make us content to let impression do duty for information

and preference for reasoned conviction. But there is one obstacle more formidable than all the rest, and that is scepticism. We do not really believe—at least that is true of far too many of us—we do not really believe that a peaceful world is possible. We would like to have it if we could, but we suspect that the dice are loaded against us from the start; and therefore we are not willing to make the effort which is necessary to insure success.

And there are plenty of people who are making it their business to reinforce us in our scepticism. In a recent address at the University of Glasgow a distinguished Englishman, former Lord Chancellor of his country, after referring in patronising terms to the founder of Christianity as an idealist who did not expect His words to be taken seriously, and paying tribute to those who were responsible for establishing the League of Nations as "men who forget human nature as absurdly as they neglect history," summed up his conclusion as to the present international situation as follows:

"For as long a time as the records of history have been preserved human society has passed through a ceaseless process of violence and adjustment. This process has been sometimes pacific, but more often it has resulted from war-like disturbances. The world continues to offer glittering prizes to those who have stout arms and sharp swords, and it is therefore extremely improbable that the experience of future nations will differ in any material respect from that which has happened since the twilight of the human race. It is for us, therefore, to prove in our history a martial rather than a military people; to abstain, as has been our habit, from provocations, but to maintain in

our own hands adequate means for our protection and, so equipped, to march with head erect and bright eyes along the road to our imperial destiny."

The spirit which inspired these words is our greatest danger today—the spirit which makes the past the measure of the future. Because men have fought in the past we must take it for granted that they will still fight in future. When men hold up a different ideal, the ideal of a United States of Europe, let us say, when they suggest that we settle our disputes by peaceable methods and substitute law for force as the final arbiter in international affairs, they are sneered at as impracticable idealists. This would be something new and, therefore, not to be expected. This would be taking Jesus seriously, whereas we are disciples of an older and wiser teacher, that disillusioned sage who summed up his life's philosophy in the despairing sentence: "The thing that has been is the thing that shall be." "It is extremely improbable," says Lord Birkenhead, "that the experience of future nations will differ in any material respect from what has happened since the twilight of the human race,"—so improbable that we must dismiss it from our calculations and give ourselves with new energy to the old business of competitive armament.

That is not the way our scientists are talking. They do not make the past their measure of the future. On the contrary, they set no limits to their expectation. To them nature is a vast reservoir of power waiting to be released, and the discovery of yesterday is already forgotten in the exhilaration that comes with the possibility of tomorrow.

If Lord Birkenhead wants us to accept his attitude toward war he will really have to do something with

the scientists. They have not caught his point of view. While he is telling us that because men have always fought they always will fight, the scientists are seeing to it that if we fight in the future it shall be at least in a different way. Then it was a war of armies against armies, now it is a war of nations against nations. Then it was a war of one nation against another, or at most of two or three, now war has become an international affair, and it is more dangerous to stay out than to get in. Then the slain were numbered by the thousands, or at most the tens of thousands, but now whole cities are blotted out and the death roll climbs into the millions. Then there were "glittering prizes" to be won by those who had "stout arms and sharp swords," but now war leaves the victors impoverished as well as the vanquished, and the prizes are bankruptcy, lawlessness and disillusionment. If we must fight, at least let us be under no illusions as to what is in store for us. Will Irwin and Philip Gibbs have told us in plain words, and the man who has not read and weighed what they have said is living in a fool's paradise.

Our first business, then, I repeat, is to revise our expectations. We must meet this council of despair with a gospel of hope. But if we are to do this successfully we must do it intelligently. Vague generalities will not do. We must meet facts with facts, program with program. If our scientists are confident it is because of what they have seen and done. If we are to recover our lost expectancy we, too, must see something and we must do something.

We must see something. There is a fund of good will in mankind which is waiting to be used if only we are ingenious enough to find ways to use it. The fact that we haven't succeeded in doing it yet is no more

reason for giving up trying than the fact that so many generations passed without the discovery of electricity is a reason why Franklin should not have flown his kite or Morse perfected his telegraph or Marconi unlocked for us the mysteries of radio. In human affairs, as in the sciences, where there is a will there is a way. And it is for us to create the will by pointing out the way.

They tell us that a United States of Europe is impossible; but that is just what we were told about the United States of America. They tell us that the World Court is too weak to succeed; but that is what they said of our United States Supreme Court when it began its work. They tell us that peace cannot be secured without armament; but we have recently celebrated the anniversary of a hundred years of peace with a country with which we had once fought and with which we concluded peace on the basis of a mutual destruction of armament. They tell us that defeat in war necessarily breeds the spirit of revenge; but we have seen the general who led the defeated army in one of the most stubbornly contested wars of our time, become prime minister of the power which had defeated him, and the most distinguished advocate of the gospel of good will. These are but a few of many illustrations which might be given of the stores of good will that are available for our use if only we can develop ingenuity to use them.

But this goodwill must be organised. That, I repeat, is what the World Alliance is trying to do. It is the attempt to get back of the governments to the people they represent and to interpret in united and impressive form these aspirations for justice and peace which, so long as they are purely individual, remain largely inarticulate. The World Alliance is not a substitute for

the more formal machinery of international conciliation —the Hague Court, the League of Nations, the treaties of arbitration between different nations—it is an agency for generating the public opinion which will insure their being used.

That is all very well, say our imperialist friends. It is what you idealists have always been doing, and you see what you have made of things up to date. What guarantee have we that in this newest effort you will fare any better? Well, there is this, at least, in our favour, that there is machinery to be used. The League of Nations in its present form may be far from perfect, but even as it is, it is a forum on which the international conscience may find expression, an agency through which the things can be done which that conscience approves. The trouble, I repeat, is not with our machinery, it is with our spiritual attitude, and this is our justification for enlisting the aid of the Church. Other agencies deal with one phase of our life or another—our business, our politics, our education, our pleasure. Religion is concerned with man as man. The Church includes men of all walks of life, of all interests, of all countries. It is, therefore, peculiarly fitted to interpret these aspirations which we share with people of other countries and which make us citizens of the world.

What, then, have we been able to do through the Alliance and the other Christian agencies that are co-operating with it in this campaign; the Federal Council, the Church Peace Union and the rest, to enlist the services of the Christian people of the different countries in the cause of world peace?

In the first place, we have been working to bring about contacts, contact between the lovers of peace in

each country and between such people in different countries.

And when I speak of contact I do not mean physical contact merely. I mean that rarer thing—contact of the mind. We are trying to understand one another, trying to discover what it is that keeps us apart and to find out whether there is not some way in which we can come together.

We are trying to do this and, what is better still, we are succeeding. During the last eighteen months it has been my privilege to attend four international gatherings in the interest of world peace, and I think that for those, at least, who attended them they registered a steady progress toward unity of aim and definition of program. Difficulties that seemed insuperable when looked at from a distance proved manageable when attacked about a table, and national suspicion and fear were dissipated in the fires of Christian confidence and sympathy.

One memory stands out with special vividness. It was at a meeting of the Management Committee of the World Alliance held at Zurich, in April of last year. Twenty-three countries were represented, including the French, the Germans and the Belgians. We had been called together to consider the situation in the Ruhr and to decide what action, if any, ought to be taken in the matter by the churches. Convictions differed widely and feeling ran high. Frank words were spoken on both sides. More than once it seemed as if the clash of interests was irreconcilable and the meeting must leave us even farther apart than when we came.

Happily these fears were dissipated. There was one asset which we possessed more potent than all our lia-

bilities, and that was goodwill. In the effort of each to see through his brother's eyes and safeguard the interests which he regarded as essential so far as it was humanly possible, a plan of action was evolved which all present found themselves able to accept with a good conscience. It may interest you to hear what that plan was. It was to refer the whole matter to an international conference in which neutral nations, we as well as those interested, should be represented; a conference to be called, if possible, under the auspices of the League of Nations.

Stated here in the quiet atmosphere of this World Alliance this may seem a very simple and obvious solution, but I assure you it did not seem so at Zurich. To the French it meant the abandonment of the policy of independent action to which their government had committed them; to the Germans the acceptance of an organisation which they had been taught to regard as the agent of their enemies' oppressive policy. Yet each came to see that the plan proposed offered larger possibilities than any that either could hope to put through separately.

But the contact of selected individuals is not enough. Such contacts must be multiplied in each of the countries represented. It is not enough that a few of us here or there want peace and are willing to work for it. We must want it intelligently enough to devise a program in which we can interest large numbers of our fellow citizens.

In a recent letter from Washington, William Hard, the correspondent of the new periodical, "Time," thus describes the attitude of our public men toward international co-operation. "A year ago," he said, "a line could be drawn between co-operators and non-co-

operators. Now, almost everyone wants co-operation, but each one wants it in his own way. One wants us to co-operate with Germany against France, another with France against Germany, a third with England to put pressure on France, and a fourth has still a different plan. One proposal neutralises another, and in the multitude of counsels nothing is done. So far as effective action is concerned, we might as well be non-co-operators."

It is a description that can be duplicated nearer home. We have spent an immense amount of energy in our advocacy of peace, but it has not produced commensurate results because it has been dissipated. The advocates of an association of nations would have none of the League and those who believe in the outlawry of war have had no interest in a Court which was content to stop such wars as it could. Surely the time has come for a more intelligent attitude. In other relations of life we use existing agencies till we can devise better; why should we not do so here? One need not be blind to the faults of the present League to see that it is doing good work in a field in which no one else is doing anything. Or surrender one's belief that the ultimate goal is the outlawry of war in order to recognise that we now have a Court through which those who would rather not fight can find the peaceable means of settling their disputes. Let us get back of what we have with all our might while at the same time we devote our best energy to devising something better.

This is a view to which more and more people are coming today. It found striking expression in a recent editorial in *Unity* in which John Haynes Holmes, hitherto one of the most determined opponents of the League of Nations, urges union in a program in which

the League shall be included. Instead of trying to make our own pet plans prevail at any cost we are coming to see that we must co-operate with others in the ways that seem to them most practicable.

I have recently been reading a little pamphlet entitled "International Problems and the Christian Way of Life." It has been prepared by a group of persons who have been spending a number of months in trying in a thoroughly impartial and objective way to analyse the questions which we face as Christians when we try to do our duty in the modern world. The pamphlet appears under the auspices of the Executive Committee of the proposed Conference on the Christian Way of Life as one of a series of studies designed to assist earnest and sincere people in their effort to see their way more clearly in the perplexing situation in which the world finds itself today. Though this pamphlet has only been issued in provisional form, nearly three thousand copies have already found their way into the hands of individuals and groups who propose to make it the basis of their study in the coming winter, and that number is likely in the near future to be largely increased. May we not see in this new attitude toward international questions—an attitude of which this is only one of many illustrations which might be given—a sign which gives promise of a better day?

There is no reason, therefore, to be discouraged. Things are moving, and they are moving in the right direction. Even Lord Birkenhead, gloomy as is his outlook, does not contend that war is inevitable. Once in a while, he admits, the necessary readjustments have taken place peaceably. "Only," he reminds us, "this chance comes very seldom." But that admission is all we need. The fact that it is hard to find a peaceable

way out need not dishearten us if only it be admitted that it is possible. To the true man, committed to a great cause, difficulties are simply a challenge to more rigourous discipline and more complete devotion.

It comes back at last to you and to me. The leader will come if only we do our part to get ready for him. Indeed, I suspect that he is here already if we had eyes to see him. There are men in high places today who believe what you and I believe and are trying to bring it about. Lord Robert Cecil is such a man, General Smuts is such a man, Professor Masaryk is such a man, President Benes, if all that we hear of him is true, is such a man. There may be others of whom we do not know, working quietly and biding their time. But they cannot do their work alone, they must find the way prepared, and that is your business and mine.

Recently I was at New Haven watching the Army play against Yale. At my side was a famous football player of earlier days who was explaining to me the philosophy of the game. "In order to gain ground," he said, "the line men must make a gap and the man who has the ball must go through, and they must do it at the same time. The gap need not be wide, and it need not last long, but it must be utilised when the chance comes."

It is just so in our fight for a peaceful world. We are facing a line of prejudice and self-interest which seems insurmountable, but once in a while we are able to make a breach through which the man with ideals can push through and press on. Do not let us forget in our cry for leadership that the best of leaders will be impotent unless we on the line put our shoulders to the task and make the rift in public opinion through

which the statesman and the diplomat can push on to permanent achievement.

In a letter to a friend written many years ago Campbell-Bannerman, that great statesman to whose enlightened leadership England owes the settlement of the Boer War, has this to say of the methods to be followed in dealing with those former enemies: "It is not by force of arms that South Africa will be lost, but by misgovernment, and instead of blustering about reinforcements and army reform, or—shall we say—platitudinising about commercial education, it would be well if our eminent ones applied themselves to this problem, How to make those love us who now hate us."

How to make those love us who hate us—is not this the word we need today? We have organised everything else, our armies and our navies, our ambitions and our greeds, has not the time come to organise our goodwill?

IV

CHRIST OR MARS *

WILL IRWIN,

Author "The Next War," etc.

IF in the decade between 1904 and 1914 the churches of the Christian world had said, "Thou shalt not," there would have been no general European war. If the churches should say today, with one voice, "Thou shalt not!" there would never be another war.

The solution of this question—the most pressing problem which confronts the world today, "is in the hands of the churches," if they care to use it—organised Christianity and organised Judaism. It would take centuries to build up such an organisation for peace as these churches, an organisation so powerful over the minds and hearts and imaginations of men, so experienced in dealing with human problems, and one so rich and powerful.

But as events rushed on to the catastrophe of 1914, none raised even a feeble voice to protest against the horror and shame which the Christian nations were about to loose upon the world. Christ, gagged and bound, was delivered by His own servants captive to Mars. They did this for the most part blindly, not knowing what they did. But, if they betray Him

* A book by Mr. Irwin bearing this title, was recently published by D. Appleton & Co.

again, they will do it consciously, out of the cowardice of their own hearts—as did Judas.

For now the world knows what war is! Those among us who are not fools, perfectly understand that modern war is rooted in greed, that it serves no good end of the spirit, that its moral fruits are hatred, lechery, disintegration of moral fibre in the nation and in the individual. If war were what old-fashioned theology used to call a "Means of Grace," if it sent its victims to death and its survivors back to civil life better men, it would be your business to support it, no matter how great its physical agonies. But I, who saw the late war from its first battle to its last, who saw it with six nations, who saw it at front and rear, am here to tell you that it is not. Anyone who says that the average man is a better man because of the war of 1914-1918, is lying—consciously or unconsciously to himself. It does not even rescue peoples from what the militarists call softness. Never did humanity at war display such courage as in the late European struggle. The farmers of France, the mechanics of England and the factory operatives of Germany performed every day before breakfast deeds which made Thermopylæ and the Alamo seem like petty squabbles. And these heroes had lived out their lives in a period of profound peace. Every man of science who concerns himself with the breeding of the species knows that, in reality, modern conscription plus war—the selection of the best men to die before they have given any children to their stock—is a device for softening the breed so ingenious that it might have been invented by the Devil himself.

The first and most obvious evil of modern war from the viewpoint of the moralist, is that it hampers, fetters, and destroys that concerted effort to bring the Kingdom

of Heaven on earth, which is the chief higher aim of organised Christianity—" Thy Kingdom Come." Few, I think, will dispute this. However, this special evil might be tolerated if the harm were balanced by some special moral good. If battles were a means of grace; if the unlucky warriors died and the lucky survived with souls more subtly attuned to the infinite; if finally they left, because of their heroism, a higher spiritual atmosphere, then Christian morals might continue to tolerate war. The sincere militarist, whenever he happens also to be a Christian, believes that war does confer all these benefits, and is therefore a spiritual gain to our race.

His candid opponent must admit that this position was once fairly sound. And here exactly lies the most perplexing point in the morals of war. The average man, called out to fight for his country, seems to himself to be imitating that supreme act of sacrifice by which Christ crowned and completed His ministry. Once, it was more than seeming. When he went voluntarily though reluctantly, when he was not pressed into service by the power of some overlord or drawn into the ranks by some primitive desire of loot or slaughter, he made a supreme, unselfish sacrifice beyond which man cannot go. Else all our cenotaphs to the soldier dead, our memorial poems, our heroic ballads, were mockeries.

The shallow biological analogy involved in the militaristic phrase " survival of the fittest " was long ago discredited by science. But that is aside from the mark. The point here is that men, unassisted by propaganda, no longer had a firm, undivided view of the sanctity involved in dying for one's country. Reason began to play its light into the dark corners of their minds; or, to phrase it as do the militarists, " their patriotism was

weakened, they grew soft through too much peace." From first to last of the Great War, a thousand soldiers of all nations, if one, asked me what it was all about, anyhow? And this, mind, was not a straight inquiry of one who wants to know, but a rhetorical question, plainly put by way of eliciting the answer, "nothing!" That old, unquestioning valour to which death in battle for one's country seemed a sacrament, an act of supreme consecration, was passing away.

Wherefore the lords of Europe's destiny in the Nineteenth Century devised another and less noble stimulus for the flagging morale of peoples. In place of narrow consecration, they managed to substitute hate, pure hate. The printing press was the agency by which mankind was growing a little international, a little disposed to question the validity of exclusive patriotism. They took this agency, perverted it from its natural purposes, made it serve their ends. The process was not difficult. The universal fascination of gossip proves that the malevolent is so much more interesting than the benevolent! In the spiritual realm as in the material, it is easier to destroy than to create; it is easier to rewake the slumbering barbarian in civilised man than to lead him to higher levels of thought and action. However, the better and more natural influence of the printed word on international politics—to make men understand that they may forgive—was never entirely overcome; and in all literature and journalism of the Nineteenth Century one traces this dual tendency, these conflicting currents.

What chancelleries and general staffs accomplished in the way of inducing artificial hate appeals to the detached observer as divinely ridiculous; to laugh at it in the proper spirit one would need the humour and the pity of a god.

How repellent and yet how supremely ridiculous seem now the expressions of hatred which were to us then the daily food of the mind during those four years of war. The Germans were rough, to put the matter with all Christian mildness, in their passage through Belgium. There were German atrocities; however, I prefer to call them now, nine years from the event, *militaristic* atrocities. The German General Staff had issued orders designed to cow the Belgians, to render them spiritually incapable of resistance. The German army, under iron discipline, obeyed those orders. Here and there, of course, were sporadic episodes of violence or outrage. You cannot mobilise a million and a half men without including some natural thugs and born degenerates whose tendencies will come out in the red mists of war. Here and there, as at Gerbévillers in France, a militarist, drunken with his poison theory and French wine, exceeded his orders and made of occupation a massacre. It remains to be shown, whether any army or any nation similarly well grounded in the philosophy of militarism, similarly well disciplined, would have behaved any better in the circumstances.

Surely, in its compromise between Christ and Mars, Christianity never made terms with hatred—tearing, murderous hatred against unknown and unseen individuals. In all systems of Christian morals, hate figures as the little brother of murder. The Roman Catholic Church, preparing its communicants for confession, specifically classifies desire for revenge and cherishing an unforgiving spirit as violations of the Fourth Commandment; and Protestantism holds much the same attitude. That "righteous wrath" of which we hear so much in war is a mere phrase. It is perhaps possible for a man of exceptionally high, noble moral qual-

ity to loathe simply in a spirit of right and justice such a system as that of the old German Imperial Government, and to kill the individual German in a spirit of love, as one tenderly chloroforms a crippled pet dog. It may be possible—but it didn't happen.

If the soldier was by nature generous, kind, forgiving of offense, we set about to change him. Bayonet practice, the jabbing of a dummy German in vital points of the enemy, was a most effective piece of "psychological preparation," the sergeants in charge of this game invented a kind of hymn of hate, a familiar combination of American oaths chanted to the swing of the rifle. It went like this: "God" (present point) "damn" (swing back) "you!" (thrust). The hysterical, romantic literature of the war pictured men as they died in action calling on God's mercy or their mothers or crying with the last breath "Vive La France!" How many, I wonder, died with the sergeant's Hymn of Hate upon their lips?

Lingering hatred against an enemy, especially a victorious one, has marked the aftermath of all wars. Germany defeated France in 1870, and tore the unwilling Alsace-Lorraine from the land of their allegiance. The French, in the decade that followed, hated Germany with a bitterness almost insane. We Americans of the older generation remember the mood of the South after the Civil War. Yet both these historic hatreds, lacking fuel, were dying within ten years; were within a generation for all practical purposes already dead. France was gradually letting Alsace-Lorraine fade into the vast background of old historic wrongs. Although certain zealots made their annual pilgrimage to the Strasbourg Monument in Paris, although the younger officers of St. Cyr still gnashed

their teeth, not one Frenchman in twenty would have gone to war to recover the lost provinces. In 1906, fifteen thousand French schoolmasters demanded of the government that they be allowed to teach in the Public Schools the follies of war, the blessings of peace. The government granted this boon. In its article headed "Peace," the Encyclopædia Britannica, edition of 1910, described France as the pacifist nation of Europe. A people in such a mood is not making hatred a governing motive in life. As for the South, the collapse of her economic life and the injustices of "reconstruction" somewhat prolonged her period of bitterness; yet within fifteen or twenty years it had simmered down to a little meaningless talk. By the beginning of this century, South and North were working together, governing together.

For in those inefficient days of hit and miss methods, the reactionary elements in our civilisation had not learned the use of cultivated hate to militaristic plans. It is going to be different from now on. The guns of Armageddon were scarcely stilled before ten thousand trained propagandists set themselves to perpetuate for political convenience the resentments and follies of the late war. A controlled popular press reiterated the old slanders against the enemy, invented new lies, dressed up half truths.

"The trouble with Christianity," says Bernard Shaw, "is that it has never been tried." Probably when you read this, you were offended. But in this most vital matter of war, Shaw is absolutely right. For more than a century now—that century during which man first began to look naked-eyed at certain world-old human institutions—the Church has closed its eyes to this whole question of war. It has tried to

hide in squirrel holes from the purposes of God. Its course has been cowardly—I should be cowardly myself if I used a softer word for it.

We who understand these things and are not silenced by professional ethics, like so many soldiers and sailors who understanding can not speak, know perfectly well what another general war is going to mean to this civilisation which calls itself Christian. Just after the late war, some of us said that it was now a case of nations against nations, not armies against armies; that henceforth the weakest civilian man, woman or child, would be as much fair game for slaughter as the strongest soldier. We told you that modern air-craft with modern explosive bombs, and modern gases could, in a night, destroy all life in any city in the world. And we told you that in any future war between civilised and organised nations, this would probably be the first tactical move. Most of the public laughed and called us dreamers—then. And now, the keynote of diplomatic relations between France and Great Britain is the fact that France has nearly three hundred squadrons of bombing planes to Britain's fifty; and that, if it comes to war, France can and will destroy London. Do not take this as a slight on France. In the same circumstances, Great Britain would do the same thing. So would we, I am afraid, in case we went to war. If you doubt this, let me ask you this question: Had the American people learned, on any June day in 1918, that Berlin had been destroyed by air-craft, would the news have given America any thrill of horror? You know that we would have hung out every flag and illuminated every public building! War is so.

The European peoples with their petty hatreds and greeds and jealousies are blindly preparing to commit

suicide; and, we in America stand by, and a little condescendingly watch them do it, and thank God that we are not as other men. And yet the average American is only three or four centuries removed from the parent stock of Europe. Placed in the same situation he would do exactly the same thing. The fault is not with any one man, or any one group of men. The fault is just common human blindness, common human lack of understanding. And the one force in modern life which can open the eyes of the world and illuminate their hearts has hitherto stood by supinely, blandly indifferent.

However, mankind will never abolish war until it ceases to want war. Along with any organisation of nations to keep the peace must go a progressive education of public opinion. Of course, nineteen out of twenty people do want permanent peace, or think they do. But do they want hard enough? Are they willing to forego the not unpleasant emotion of hate, to resist the temptations of temporary national advantage, to shut their hearts to certain old stirrings of the cave instinct? We have some distance yet to go before the citizens of our Christian democracies make permanent peace a main object of their political thinking.

"You cannot change the nature of man," say the militarists, repeating parrot-like a phrase, as the anti-suffragists used to repeat: "Woman's place is in the home." That, probably, is not entirely true. Green has called attention to the change which came over England in the Elizabethan period. Before that time, he says in effect, we find it hard to understand either English statesmanship or the English popular mind. We know that they did certain things, but we cannot fully understand why. However, from Cecil on, the mental

operations of any English politician are as clear to us as those of the contemporary Gladstone or Disraeli. In this period, he concludes, the psychology of Englishmen underwent a subtle transformation. And Ludwig Lewisohn has given the perfect answer. "Perhaps we cannot change the nature of man," he says, "but we can change his mood." In war, we do that very thing. Six months after the first shot sounds, any belligerent people turns from tolerance to hate, confidence to suspicion, sanity to madness. The problem consists in casting human thought into a new mould, and making the work permanent.

Yet the task, as I review this Christendom of ours, seems overwhelmingly great and difficult. Beside it the long struggle for government by the people was slight and easy. How shall we go about it? What common instrument is large enough, fine enough, powerful enough, so to regroup the faculties of men? One alone in all the world—Christianity and her elder sister, Judaism. Here alone is a power which, consciously or unconsciously, governs the moral thought of every man and woman in fifty nations. Church attendance may be falling off; peoples may be taking their religion with less literal, outward show of seriousness; but rare nevertheless is that man or woman who did not receive Christian or Jewish religious instruction in childhood; and, therefore, who does not see moral issues, all his life long, through the lenses of the Decalogue. And divided though the Church be by sects, it is not divided by nationalities. We call one branch, perhaps, the Church of England, another the Church of Scotland, another the Church of Rome. These are but the names of places where grow the parent stems. Every one of these has established its offshoots in many

nations. Considered in their political aspect, churches are the only organisations which have achieved a sound and decent internationalism. And for ages upon ages, the Church has been gathering experience with the changing mood of man. The phenomenon of conversion is little else. What an instrument for achieving permanent peace! We should work through many and many a weary generation before creating another half so well adapted to the purpose.

If all the Christian sects, combining with one another and with Judaism on this single issue, should start the work of educating their sons and daughters in the illusion and immorality of war, we should within a year mark the changing mood of man. Within twenty years, when the generation, at present learning its texts and catechism in Sunday school, reached the age of fruition, the job of bringing peace to our world would be done. The Church can do it, even if she confines herself to her oldest policy—just personal work with the individual.

Let the doubter consider our great American example. Seventy-five years ago we were a race of easy and careless drunkards. One strong division of the Christian churches in America began gradually to take up the temperance question. The nineteenth century had run half its course before any of them, as bodies, endorsed teetotalism. It was later even than that when certain denominations began to give systematic temperance instruction in the Sunday schools. Still later, the movement came firmly into politics; the idea of prohibiting alcoholic liquor by law became a definite issue. In the early years of the twentieth century, it went with a rush. State after state voted dry. And this was precisely the era when the children who had received tem-

perance instruction in the Sunday schools came to the age of political influence. With the idea that stealing, murder and adultery are wrong, they had absorbed the idea that alcoholic drink is wrong. It was part of their moral equipment.

Not otherwise must the Church proceed when, if ever, she takes up this new and vital moral reform. She must begin it in early childhood, when one gets his basic moral ideas. She has taught her young sons and daughters that good citizenship is a Christian duty; she must teach them now that perfect citizenship implies tolerance; that suspicion and generalised hatred are part of the old Adam in man; that the pledge of love and service which the Christian takes at his baptism or confirmation embraces all mankind—the whole population of the City of God. She must teach that war is not really glorious, but a calamity; that behind it lies always a large wickedness. She must teach, finally, that to be Christ's faithful soldier means, in this age, to be a soldier of peace. A few individual congregations, a very few denominations, do all this already; even if no more join in the work, we shall feel the effect fifteen or twenty years from now; and those who see merely the outside of things will wonder at a sudden "pacifist wave."

Plow work, that, but most necessary. Cultivating and harvesting call for more complex tools, more advanced methods. How shall organised religion, having set its face against war, proceed in the face of recurrent national crises? "Let the Church keep out of politics," says one conservative school of Christian thought. Which is all very well, when politics concern themselves solely with the things that are Cæsar's. Theocracies and church parties never fitted well into the

structure of human society, and are wholly out of place in democracies. But when a political issue involves a thing that is God's, the Church has seldom held aloof. In mediæval times, before Christianity was divided, the Pope laid interdicts on sovereigns and peoples guilty of gross treacheries and wickedness. When Great Britain was discussing abolition of slavery in her colonies, Established and Non-conformist congregations by thousands declared for abolition and backed it by their votes. Taking a small and rather mean example, when various of our states have proposed to exempt church property from taxation, or to revoke an exemption already existing, the churches have thrown themselves into the fight. For a larger and more recent example: when the prohibition movement began to gather headway, part of our denominations gave it their frank endorsement, conveyed to their members that to vote for any man who favoured the saloon constituted a violation of church discipline. And this war against war is a moral question if there ever was one; it ceased, somewhere in the nineteenth century, to become Cæsar's; it became God's.

No impartial and informed witness of international affairs doubts that world organisation to replace trial by battle with trial by jury and to outlaw war, is the first necessary step. Yet the American advocates of this method halt and hesitate between several conflicting schemes. If our churches as a whole ever reach agreement on one plan, give it their official endorsement and their faithful service, the job will be done. The politicians of all parties will fall over each other in their eagerness to get into their platforms. Just so, when the prohibition agitation received the official indorsement of many powerful churches, certain candidates of

both great parties who themselves drank a quart of straight whiskey a day, took the platform to denounce the liquor traffic. The German vote, the labour vote, the farmer vote, are all insignificant numerically beside the church vote; which every politician knows.

No judicious man believes that when we have founded some firm, workable society or association or league of nations to administer real international law, the task is done. No mere agreement, no mere gesture of goodwill, can in a flash eliminate one of the oldest customs known to society. It will have many devils to fight—of greed, of intrigue, of self-interest masked as patriotism, of political superstition. It cannot work perfectly at first. No new form of government ever did. The world will have its moments of a disgust which passes for disillusion. Those are the times that will try the souls of good men, and precisely the times when such an international force as organised Christianity may do its best service. Hatreds, unreasoning hatreds based mostly on lies, will be then, as now, the best weapon of those who do not desire peace. The special task of the Church will be to quell such hatreds —to prove their folly, to expose their basis of insincerity and falsehood.

Perhaps all I have had to say refers to the past. Probably the fact that you, representing three-quarters of the organised clergy of the United States, have come together in this convention and for this purpose, is the most encouraging sign of the times. Pardon me, if I have seemed to preach to you, whose business is preaching. It is an absurd world, this, just now; one of its minor absurdities is that a reporter should be obliged to turn preacher.

V

A VALID CHRISTIANITY

WILLIAM E. SWEET,

Governor of Colorado.

IT was Victor Hugo who said: "There is one thing stronger than armies and that is an idea whose time has come." The world has just witnessed the titanic strength of nations locked in the grip of war. As we see these nations still regarding one another with hostility, we are led to question whether there is any force in the world stronger than hate. And yet those of us who believe in the adjustment of all differences, through peaceful methods, know there is a force stronger than war and we must do our utmost to make the world realize that the time for this idea has come. For this great purpose we have assembled here.

England's illustrious war Premier, David Lloyd George, has just visited our shores. Everywhere he spoke to vast throngs who heard him attentively and respectfully. Some have questioned, however, whether he has changed the opinion of many of our citizens by his visit. Without detracting in the least from my very great admiration of Lloyd George's dominant personality, his fine mental resources and his unfailing optimism, I cannot refrain from saying that if Mr. Lloyd George had not opposed Mr. Wilson during the trying days of the Versailles conference he might not have found it necessary to come to the United States at this

time to implore our aid in the hour of Europe's extremity. We know that President Wilson laboured in vain for a different peace than was finally made. We know how tenaciously he held to his fourteen points as the basis of our negotiations with the enemy countries, but Mr. Lloyd George, in company with Clemenceau, stood squarely against any such concessions. We are implored now " to cast our great might into the scales of peace," but in 1919 England did not care to listen to our President as he sought then to cast our great might into a tolerable peace. You will remember that when Mr. Lloyd George made his campaign for re-election he was determined that " Germany should pay, and pay to the last farthing." Although there were eminent British economists who said, from the time the Peace Treaty was signed, that Germany could not pay, they were not heeded. And now, defeated at home, his policies repudiated and with no way to make Germany pay, Lloyd George again asks us to help rescue Europe from the crisis which his course has precipitated.

President Wilson knew better than any one else, in 1919, what would be the inevitable results of the Peace Policy. With unerring judgment he predicted the conditions now existing on the Continent. Have we not felt at times that President Wilson might better have followed the dictates of his judgment and his conscience and returned to America when he declared his purpose to do so?

Despite this, I would not have you think that I believe Britain's Macedonian cry should go unheeded by America. Not so!

Let us recall the eventful years from 1914, when the war began, to April, 1918, when we entered the struggle. At the beginning our people were neutral, includ-

ing President Wilson and President Roosevelt. Again and again we were visited by British and French statesmen asking us to see our duty as they did, but all to no purpose. European quarrels, we said, were no concern of ours. Then, as now, we were an enigma to Europe, and in some quarters we were also anathema. But gradually, as the purposes of the enemy nation began to unfold, we came to see what these purposes meant for world civilisation and with that idealism for which America has ever stood in the past, we entered the World War, being convinced, as G. K. Chesterton has said, that "In the end the world can not rejoice in anything less than the whole scheme of things."

We may or may not favour America's entering the Permanent Court of International Justice; we may be for or against the outlawry of war, but, friends, we cannot advocate isolation. We did not favour isolation in 1917, and we should not favour it now. Isolation is impossible because of America's power, strength and vast wealth. We are doing business throughout the entire world, our branch agencies, manufacturing houses and banks are to be found everywhere, and how absurd it is for us to say that what goes on in Europe does not concern us. From a materialistic standpoint, isolation is impossible. The Atlantic Ocean does not act as a barrier to keep us out of war, nor does proximity alone lead a nation into war, for both Denmark and Switzerland were neutral during the recent struggle.

There is much criticism of the League of Nations these days, but when we consider that the League is attempting to function while war is still in progress in some parts of Europe and many of the questions growing out of the World War have not been settled, we

must admit that the League has functioned very effectively. While at the beginning it was feared that large and powerful nations would dominate the League, it has been shown conclusively that the smaller nations, by standing together, have been able to safeguard their interests. It is not necessary to mention here the successful financing of Austria by the League, the recent settlement of the difficulty between Italy and Greece, and other acute situations which have been relieved by action of the League.

When we consider all the difficulties in the way, the animosities and hatreds which were left at the close of 1919, we marvel at the accomplishments of the League.

Dean Wigmore, of Northwestern University, has just returned from Geneva, where he attended the recent assembly of the League of Nations, and says: "The League is just as alive as the Congress of the United States, and has quenched the fires of several impending wars."

Upon his return from Europe, last summer, Senator Hiram Johnson, in speaking of the next war, made this statement: "If that bloody war is no concern of ours, and comes from causes of which we are no part, I would not send a single American soldier again across the seas." We would all agree with this premise, but no great war could take place in which we would not be concerned. By this I do not mean that we would necessarily be a part to it, but it would certainly vitally concern America. Only by co-operating with other nations in establishing world peace, and not by isolating ourselves, can we hope to keep out of war.

In this assembly it is unnecessary to say that the cry "America First" is utterly at variance with the Christian ideal. There was a time in the history of the

Christian Church when we felt no obligation to the non-Christian world, but now the dominant note in the 20th century program of Christianity is foreign missions. Our belief in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man makes it obligatory upon the Christian Church to regard the world as one family of nations.

It is a notable fact that leading statesmen and publicists of all nations have united since the World War in declaring that the philosophy of life proclaimed by Jesus Christ is the only solution for the turmoil, jealousy and hatred from which the world suffers. This is the universal verdict of Christian and non-Christian alike. Is not the Church, therefore, summoned "to reconsider its own Gospel and to interpret for our time the way of life involved in Christian discipleship" as applied to international relations? The Church, Protestant and Roman Catholic, is the only institution in society whose sole task it is to study and interpret to the world the spirit and ideals of Jesus Christ. For this cause the Church was founded. If it ceases to proclaim service and sacrifice as the laws of God's kingdom, and love as the basis of national, as well as individual, salvation, the influence of the Church upon civilisation will become negligible and some other agency will take the place of the Church in the task of redeeming civilisation.

On the other hand, if the Church proclaims courageously and fearlessly the message as the world expects it to do, its power and influence will increase without question.

President Wilson, in his recent essay entitled "The Road Away from Revolution," says: "The sum of the whole matter is this—that our civilisation cannot sur-

vive materially unless it be redeemed spiritually. It can be saved only by becoming permeated by the spirit of Christ and being made free and happy by the practices which spring out of that spirit."

General John F. O'Ryan, one of the leading generals in the World War, says: "The American people can end war in our time if they get on the job. Let us wage peace." This is a characteristically American way of putting the matter. We were on the job in 1918, and with what results the world knows. America is not on the job now waging peace. But if we were I am sure our efforts would be as effective as when we waged war in 1918. If the Church could be thoroughly aroused to its obligation it could go further than any other agency toward compelling this nation to end war in our time, but it is not gripped by the importance of the task—it does not know its power.

In its organised capacity, the Church is by far the most powerful and influential force in America, but it is in grave danger of permitting some other agency to snatch the moral initiative from it.

If it is not the task of the Church to wage peace, then there is no organisation whose work it is.

What a splendid spirit the Church showed and what effective work it accomplished at the time of the Armament Reduction Conference! You will remember how the public was stirred by the broadsides issued by the Church and by the sermons of our ministers. Indeed the agitation was so splendid that the Secretary of State was led to question whether the churches were not perhaps going too far. Undoubtedly the strong public opinion thus aroused made our officials more vigourous and bold in their advocacy of the purpose of the Conference.

The power of the Church is again evidenced in the ending of the twelve-hour day in the steel industry. The head of the steel business in this country repeatedly said that the eight-hour day could not and would not be installed in his corporation. Undismayed, the Federal Council of Churches conducted investigations, and published their findings to the world. They demanded a hearing before the Senate Committee, which aided in arousing public opinion on the question. The daily press very generally took the side of the Church against the steel company, and President Harding succeeded in having the long day abolished.

While the task of establishing world peace presents almost insuperable difficulties, involves party politics and international relationships, yet the Church at home and abroad has an opportunity such as it has not had since the day of its foundation. Friends, let the Church dare to do this thing that every one knows ought to be done, at this time when no other agency will do it.

A valid Christianity for today would seek to abolish war because, aside from other horrors of war, hate is the logical outcome and inevitable fruit of war. Were we not fed up on hate during the war? He who hated most was supposed to exhibit the highest form of patriotism, and the pulpit vied with the press in seeing which could be the most effective in creating a propaganda of hate. Furthermore, Church members for the most part endorsed what was being said and done. A prominent pastor near Chicago, whom I know very well, was expelled from his pulpit because he prayed for German mothers whose sons were being killed in the war. How we glorified hate and helped to fill the world with it! And now we are reaping what we sowed; the world is rife with animosity and hate. The

school books of France have been re-written since the war in order that the minds of the French children may be poisoned against the Germans.

I am not interested in philosophical discussions of whether war is ever justifiable. Generally, those who hold that it is justifiable argue that war is inevitable, hence it behooves us to prepare for the next war. This doctrine is abhorrent. There is nothing in common between it and the command of Christ to love our enemies and to do good to those who despitefully use us. There is just one standard for the individual and the nation, and that is world brotherhood. "The brotherhood which stops at national frontiers is not the brotherhood of Jesus Christ." Either love or hate will eventually rule the world. Both cannot rule. Let every churchman resolve that, as for him and his house, they will serve the God of Love.

The greatest need of the world is a Christianity of reality. What do we mean when we pray "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth, even as it is in heaven"? What do we mean when we recall at the Christmas season the angels' chorus announcing the birth of Christ, "Peace on earth, goodwill to men"? Do we mean spiritual peace alone, or a real, present day peace for all mankind? Is goodwill among men simply to be talked about, or it is to be realised? The world is weary of Christian platitudes. Dr. Fosdick, in his recent address to the Congregational Council in Springfield, made a significant statement when he declared that "the time is upon us when all theoretical questions concerning the mystical nature of Jesus are being eclipsed by the practical issue of whether or not His professed followers will take Jesus in earnest." In relation to industrial and international questions it must

be said that the Church is now teaching one thing and practicing another.

A valid Christianity for today would go forward confident in the belief that Christianity was practicable and that it was possible to make the teachings of Jesus dominant in the world. If Christ's law of love is impracticable and impossible of fulfillment, then why continue to preach it? If it is not applicable to all of life, then why preach its universality?

Benjamin Kidd, of Oxford, in his great book, "The Science of Power," says,

"There is not an existing institution in the world of civilised humanity which cannot be profoundly modified or altered or abolished in a single generation. There is no form or order of government or of the dominion of force which cannot be removed out of the world within a generation. There is no ideal in conformity with the principles of civilisation dreamed of by any dreamer or idealist which cannot be realised within the lifetime of those around him.

"Civilisation, in short, has not arrived. The stupendous potentiality of civilisation as distinct from barbarism, consists in its cultural or collective heredity, imposed on the rising generation under suitable conditions. The most important element in this, namely, the idealisms of mind and spirit conveyed to the young of each generation under the influence of the social passion, is absolutely limitless in its effect. The power which is represented thereby is capable of creating a new world in the lifetime of a generation. It is capable of sweeping away in a single generation any existing order of the world, but it has never been seen actually in being, directed and controlled by civilisation."

It is well known that Germany in not more than a generation changed the attitude of the entire nation toward the question of war. Beginning with the

young, continuing up through the high schools and universities, the glory of war was proclaimed, and as a result of this educational program the psychology of the whole people underwent a complete transformation and Germany was changed from a peace-loving people to the most warlike nation of the world. If the German government through its educational system could carry modern Germany into the World War of 1914, why cannot America, by influencing the mind of the young, educate this nation for peace?

As education lifted the world out of mediæval darkness into the Renaissance, so education today could break the bonds of custom, tradition and prejudice in all lands, removing from the world the domination of force. Surely America will lead in this great task, fraught with difficulty, but worthy of all courage and idealism.

VI

THE SENATOR AND THE CITIZEN

HARRIET B. LAIDLAW,

Chairman, Welfare Committee New York League of Women Voters.

YEARS ago, Secretary Hay spoke in sorrow and bitterness of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate as "that morgue of all international hopes." How he would have "raged despairingly" if he could see the wretched thing now! Never has the obvious intention of the members of that Committee to play their own political and self-seeking games been as blatantly exhibited.

The League of Women Voters nationally under the leadership of its Foreign Relations Committee has been doing one of the most outstanding pieces of work in the history of that purposeful organisation. During a certain week in October deputations went to every Senator in the United States. These deputations were very carefully selected, outstanding Republican women interviewing the Republican Senators and similarly Democratic women waiting upon the Democratic Senators. These interviews sometimes lasted an hour or two. In many cases they constituted a fine, sincere clearing house of opinion on international affairs, especially upon our entrance in the World Court, but in many cases the amount of bunk and hokum that was uttered, the red herrings that were trailed across the

paths of the women who spoke in these conferences was unbelievable. It is to be regretted that in place of the hundreds of women who attended these conferences, thousands could not have been present, for every woman who was at all disingenuous, came away from such of these conferences with her thinking clearer and her purpose stiffened.

Two things were urged by the League of Women Voters' deputations, and must be urged upon the Senators by hundreds of other organisations and hundreds of thousands of individual citizens;—our entrance into the World Court this winter, which involves their promise: one, to vote for this measure; two, to vote to discharge the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate from further consideration of the World Court proposal if it is not reported out in a reasonable length of time, say, in January or February.

We are getting very cynical evidences of the inclinations of the Senators of this Committee. One Senator blustered and said: "The proposition will not be reported on except over my dead body,"—and added with a leer: "At least not until after Election."

All over the United States the men and women are holding meetings in which noble sentiments are being uttered about world peace, our entrance into the World Court, and the present-day responsibility of the United States. Such meetings are characterised by an intensity of desire that the United States shall take its proper place in international organisation for world safety, but nothing happens. It reminds one of the quaint old expression of futility, whereby it was suggested that people would get ahead faster if "they depended upon their wishbones less and their backbones more."

What we must realise in the forthcoming campaign

for the World Court is that no matter how noble the utterance of ideals, how large the meeting, it is all waste motion if it does not reach the political mark. Definitely the political mark is: letters and telegrams showered in upon the President of the United States, Calvin Coolidge, the Secretary of State, Charles Evans Hughes, the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, Henry Cabot Lodge. But that is not enough. No political stone must be left unturned. A political network of influence, a political urge whose push will be irresistible, a flaming fire of public opinion which will smoke out the smug, self-seeking politicians from their fastnesses—all these things are demanded by the tense exigencies of the situation.

Let us remember that at one time there was no intention of calling the Arms Conference of 1921-22. The project, after having been broached, was given up. The powers in Washington became a little afraid of the "entanglements." Then came that nation-wide campaign for the Limitation of Armaments; literally millions of communications rained in upon the Washington offices. Rooms and closets had to be set aside to contain them. This sort of thing is evidently the white man's and the white woman's burden in actualising democracy. Until another decade or two has trained up representatives who will represent, without being beaten and driven into doing so, the task is an inevitable one to any citizen of this country who has one spark in his or her bosom of that fire that was kindled on Plymouth Rock, in Jamestown, and which flared forth in the "Spirit of '76." Otherwise we are bondmen and bondwomen, a misrepresented country, strangled and dragged in obloquy by our masters, the

high-handed and treacherous provincials of the Senate. We hear much of the self-determination of small peoples. Here we are the greatest of people, and what has become today of our self-determination? It is flaunted by men who are lost to all sense of democracy, of patriotism, of world humanity.

What other political action must we take, then, if we are worthy of that franchise which has been wrought out through the ages by the martyrs of liberty; if we are worthy the guardianship of the youth of this present generation; if we shall not richly deserve the terrible reproach that may well be heaped upon our heads by a future generation who will realise that this was the time and this the opportunity to safeguard the future peace of the world?

In addition to writing to the three executive heads of our Administration mentioned above, in addition to keeping unremittingly after each United States Senator State by State, we must make every Congressman feel his responsibility to bring influence to bear upon the Senators from his State. Every one knows that the "delegation" in Congress is the representatives and the two Senators, that there is a great deal of running back and forth between the two houses. The running back and forth is frequently on very local, log-rolling, pork-packing issues. Let us see to it that some of the "running" is done on the subject of the World Court. Senators are elected by the whole State. If every time a Congressman comes home, if every time two or three are "gathered together" in his district, he hears from them on the World Court; if every minister in his district preaches a sermon or has a meeting in his church and sends a resolution and a shower of personal letters from such a gathering, he is going to "run over" and

see the Senator, and he is going to rub his perplexed head and remark: "Say, Senator, those people back home are just after me all the time. There's nothing that I hear more about than this World Court, and they all say that I must try to do something to get you acting on the subject." There are forty-nine Congressmen in New York State. If even thirty of them came to our Senators with this story, it would have some effect. There are 500 members of the House of Representatives. If 400 of them were moved to camp on the trail of their Senators on the World Court question, something would happen.

But this is not enough. By a comparatively small individual local effort, a tremendous political pressure can be brought to bear further "back home" than that. Every member of every State Republican and Democratic Committee must be visited. A network of influence from party leaders, campaign contributors and prominent voters must be established. Moreover, to make the work thorough—and again remember this is not going to be burdensome—all County Committeemen of the leading parties must be bombarded. The other day in a speech I made this remark, and a wise old politician with a twinkle in his eye said: "Now you are talking!" The County organisation is the bulwark of the political party.

Think of the issues at stake. Isn't a definite concerted effort like this worth while? If you belong to an organisation of only 50 women, district those women by Congressional districts. If they all live in one Congressional district, let them talk as citizens of that Congressional district. Let no gesture be lost. Talk the language of the politician and the office-holder. There is no time today for lost motion. Everything that we

do must count. Be determined, be implacable; do not be afraid to be called dogmatic. Remember that this question, for instance, of the World Court is practically not a controversial question, either in its historical bearings in these United States, or in its present portent. Do not be frightened at those who speak to you in pious reproach against your "impugning motives"—that invidious phrase has backed down so many people who are pursuing a path in righteous sincerity. Remember that practically all the political opposition to the World Court is disingenuous, is dictated by ulterior motives, often of the lowest political character.

Mrs. Winter, the national president of the Federation of Women's Clubs, recently wrote a wonderful letter to the club presidents of the United States, in which she spoke of the question of World Peace as "the subject nearest to women's hearts." It is near to our hearts, but let us strive to see that it gets nearer to our heads. Subtle, clever, treacherous leadership, wantonly blind to national honour or to world safety is again raising its head in this land.

There is no doubt that women earnestly and often prayerfully desire world peace, but it is also certain that they do not feel the personal responsibility for it that they should, and that they are often futile. It is simply because we have not a lively, day-by-day working sense of what Democracy means, of what a Republican form of government, a representative government like ours, does and can mean. It is a thing to inspire every simplest man and woman in the United States—this realisation of political power.

All the political power there is in spite of the highly evolved rings and political organisations and "influences" at State capitals and in Washington, the

plain, unadorned fact is that there is just one medicine for all the ills of Democracy, and that is the "vote back home." There is just one bitter dose that will cure the moral iniquity, the callous inhumanity of those Senators, those willful little men who have played politics with the solemn urge of international responsibility for the United States, and that is the medicine of retirement—defeat at the polls.

Now there has been nothing in all history so criminally irresponsible as this determination to make a party football of pressing international matters. No treachery in human history has ever had such terrific implications. It is humanity's life and death. The co-operation of the United States is the keystone of world peace and welfare.

> "Humanity with all its fears,
> With all its hopes of coming years"—

no less is involved.

Use every bit of political influence you have. Write to your Congressman to get pressure to bear on your Senator. Talk to the County and State Committeemen of your political party. Form around yourself a network of influence to bring pressure to bear where pressure counts—that is through political channels. If enough voting citizens of these United States will exercise this passing, casual influence which resides in their person as voters, our servants in Washington will know that they have either got to do a decent job on this question or we will hire someone else to do it. If we are in earnest, we will have what we want. Is there anything that we want that counts compared with our need of sound international co-operation?

VII

THE PEOPLE AND WORLD PEACE

EDWARD L. BEACH,

Lecturer, Leland Stanford University, California.

IT is a great temptation to one whose mind is filled with thoughts of the crisis confronting the world and of the agony that convulsed it between 1914 and 1915 to speak to you of these matters.

But I know the assembly here gathered is already well educated in these subjects; its knowledge is great, its conviction is complete, its minutes are precious. So I will cut much and proceed directly to my subject, asking that it be understood and kept in mind that the underlying earnest thought back of the purpose and actions of which I will speak, is the feeling and conviction that God governs the world and that we should work as well as pray.

I come to you from Palo Alto, California, the home of Stanford University. We there have heard the cry that is going up from millions of hearts for relief from the slaughter and destruction and demoralisation of war, and we join in that cry. We believe that in every normal, earnest heart there is a feeling that war is an evil of immeasurable extent to humanity, and that means should be found to prevent war. We have listened to addresses from men and women sent abroad by the great organised peace agencies. We have received much information on the subject from many

different sources. We are convinced. And we believe we are representative in thought and feeling of the ordinary American community.

The question has come to us, "What are we to do with these convictions? What practical use are we to make of the information and instructions we have received? Is this to have merely a cultural effect upon us? Or, animated and inspired and urged by what we have received, is each of us to endeavour to do everything in his power to have war prevented?"

Referring to the work that is being carried on by the great peace organisations, the part of that work that is in public view is largely educational. The evident purpose is to present the facts of war and results of war with such convincing clearness that this knowledge of itself will urge people everywhere to combine for the purpose of taking measures and methods to prevent war. The educational work of these great peace agencies is vitally necessary, but it is not by any means all of the work to be done. Beginning with this education and knowledge the success must depend upon the earnest, determined efforts of people everywhere who have received this information. War prevention is going to be accomplished finally by the direct and immediate action of the people themselves at ballot boxes; the ballot boxes, through the action of voters, will receive the harvest grown from the seeds planted by these peace agencies; but the seeds so planted must be taken care of until the harvest is ready, and this is a local duty.

We, the people of Palo Alto, speaking only for ourselves, feel it our duty to spread where we can the information that we have received, to bring it home to the hearts and convictions of our neighbours, to organ-

ise and combine so that we may work effectively together to outlaw war.

It was under these influences and with these views that some months ago there was organised in Palo Alto, California, "The People's Movement for International Peace." The statement of principles and purpose of this Movement is as follows:

I. BELIEF: A determined effort to abolish war from the civilised world should be the dominant concern of the people of every land. Upon the people of America, the leading financial and industrial nation, rests a special responsibility to co-operate in every way toward the peaceful settlement of international differences.

In the matter of outlawing war the initiative should be taken not only by central agencies and government officials, but by the organised people in every community. It is only when the people are aroused, and a flood of public opinion makes a question of predominant political importance, that success is achieved. Thus slavery and the saloon became outlaws in our nation.

War is a great moral problem—the greatest moral problem in the world. As such, its solution should be the concern of every person of religious aspirations. The obligation to assist and lead in the solution of the problem rests in a special way upon the members of the organised religious bodies.

Wherefore, members of Catholic and Protestant Churches and Hebrew Synagogues hereby join in inaugurating the People's Movement for International Peace, whose purpose is to work unceasingly toward the realisation of world peace, using every legitimate and practical means, religious, educational, economic and political; and all men and women of goodwill are

invited to associate themselves with this Movement in order to make it permanent and effective to this high end.

II. LINES OF WORK:

The Movement proposes to work along the following lines:

1. The teaching of the duty of international and inter-racial friendship; the wickedness and futility of violence and revenge, the barbarity and destructiveness of modern warfare, and the diminishing likelihood of warfare accomplishing its avowed ends.

2. The promotion of friendly understanding among nations and their citizens, and of the disposition to compose differences on the basis of justice and right.

3. The adoption of further international agreements for the disarmament of land and naval forces to the utmost practical limit in the shortest possible time.

4. The employment of all proper means to induce the representatives of this nation to enter into conference with representatives of other nations for the purpose of providing peaceful methods of settling international differences.

This Movement does not condemn all war as unjustifiable. Military aggression and oppression must be repelled, and life, liberty and pursuit of happiness preserved, even when these ends may be attained without such cost.

A distinction must be made between questions of international character, and questions which are fundamentally of domestic concern. Questions of the former class only should be referred for decision to an international tribunal. In particular, questions involving immigration and citizenship fall within the latter class.

III. POLITICAL METHOD:

The Movement proposes no exclusive or final plan for attaining world peace by international agreement. By its very nature this end will be attained not by one, but by a series of agreements extending over a period of years. Thus the five-power treaty for limitation of naval armaments and the four-power treaty for limitation of fortifications in the Pacific are two such agreements that have already been adopted.

No pre-determined plan for attaining world peace is as important as the unified insistence by the people on the proper officials showing progress by the prompt negotiations of such additional agreements as may reasonably be expected to contribute to world peace.

The People's Movement proposes to exert pressure upon the proper authorities to be diligent and energetic in negotiating such agreements; and when such agreements are negotiated, to work for their adoption.

At the present time the proposal that America shall become associated with the Permanent Court of International Justice is before the country. The People's Movement favours the adoption of this proposal as a wise and necessary step towards world peace.

IV. GOVERNING BODY:

The governing body for Northern and Central California shall consist of a Council constituted as follows: three members from the Catholic Church, two members from the Hebrew Synagogues, and one member each from the Protestant Episcopal, Methodist Episcopal, Presbyterian, United Presbyterian, Congregational, Baptist, Friends, United Brethren, Unitarian and Disciples Churches; members from such other churches and organisations as the Council may from time to time

provide; and such additional persons as the Council may appoint to its membership.

Members of the Council shall be appointed by the presiding officer of the organisation to which such members belong. If for any reason such officer shall fail to make the appointment, the Council may select the member from such organisation.

The members of the Council shall serve for two years, or until their successors are appointed. Provided, however, that the organisation meeting called to adopt these articles shall select the members of the Council for the first year.

V. ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

The Council shall form a committee of representative citizens, residing in the various communities within its territory, to act in an advisory capacity upon suggestions for promoting the purposes of the Movement.

VI. ORGANISATION:

1. *Power of the Council.* The Council shall select a Chairman and Secretary, and an Executive Committee consisting of these officers and five other members; after receiving a recommendation from the Executive Committee, shall select a Superintendent to be the administrative head of the Movement; shall meet at least once yearly, and may be called in special meeting by the Chairman or by a majority of the Executive Committee, and shall determine from time to time the policy to be followed, approve recommendations to be made to the voters, and adopt the budget of expenditures.

2. *Executive Committee.* The Executive Committee, after recommendation by the Superintendent, shall select such assistants and clerical employees as may be found necessary or expedient. It shall advise

and assist the Superintendent in forwarding the aims of these articles and the policies of the Council. It shall select a bank to act as depository of funds, and determine the manner in which they shall be disbursed under the budget.

It shall represent the Movement in the interim between Council meetings, and shall report its actions to the succeeding meeting of the same.

3. *Superintendent.* It shall be the duty of the Superintendent to carry forward the purposes of the Movement along the lines set forth in these articles and in the actions of the Council and Executive Committee.

He shall arrange for meetings in which he and others may present the aims of the Movement; he shall use newspaper and other publicity to the same end; and he shall arrange for the collection of funds for the support of the Movement.

He shall promote the organisation of local units and local councils of the Movement along the lines heretofore followed in Palo Alto and neighbouring communities.

Our first work was to organise and plan and decide upon measures and actions. This we have done. The next was to submit our plan to every test we could devise. In carrying out these tests we have gone before church congregations and church societies, fraternal organisations, chambers of commerce, and citizens' mass meetings; also before Annual Conferences of different church denominations. We had one memorable meeting with the heads of the great religious organisations of California, Roman Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish, who met for the sole purpose of investigating the People's Movement. In every instance and in every test the People's Movement received earnest, hearty,

cordial endorsements of confidence, commendation, approval and support.

Besides this work of organisation in Palo Alto and other cities we have sent speakers to different towns to make addresses on the League of Nations, the World Court, etc. In election campaign times we expect to be active; we intend to demand that every candidate for office, municipal, state and nation shall state distinctly where he stands on different methods which may be proposed or projected for war prevention. In the meantime we are working on these matters. With us it is not a matter of meeting once a month to listen to motions and reports, though we have that also, but of working constantly, day by day. It is our idea that in our community we are the practical response and the practical reactions to the work done by the great organised agencies for peace; that these great agencies work from the top down to the ground, that we are on the ground and that our work is from the ground up to the ballot box.

Now, here is the question: Are we on the right track? Is the People's Movement for International Peace the correct answer to the work being done by the World Alliance?

In California cities of Palo Alto, Burlingame, San Francisco, Mayfield, Vallejo, Santa Cruz and Watsonville, we have gone before representatives of churches of the following denominations: Roman Catholic, Episcopal, Presbyterian, Methodist, Disciples, Mormon, Unitarian and Congregational. Local branches of the People's Movement have been organised in churches of all above denominations. Branches have also been organised in lodges of fraternal societies, women's clubs, chambers of commerce, labour unions, civic clubs,

American Legion, associations. Within the last two months California church organisations as follows, have in their meetings given endorsements of approval and commendation to their churches: the Presbyterian Synod, Congregational Conference, Methodist Conference, Unitarian Conference.

The California State Federation of Churches, at a meeting last month in San Francisco, expressed interest in the People's Movement, and a desire to co-operate. The leaders of the great religious organisations met specially to investigate the People's Movement. The Roman Catholic Church was represented by Archbishop Hanna, the Episcopal Church by Bishop Parsons, the Methodist Church by Bishop Leonard, the Presbyterian Church by Dr. Van Nuys, the Jewish Synagogue by Rabbi Meyer, the Baptist Church by Dr. Hanley. Several professors from the University of California were present; also Mr. Chester Rowell, a representative California citizen. After painstaking, earnest, rigid examination and investigation that lasted for more than three hours, upon motion of Archbishop Hanna, these gentlemen by separate vote unanimously approved of the People's Movement and formed a committee of those present for the purpose of creating a state organisation.

Just as I was typing this, a message was given me announcing the organisation of additional branches of the People's Movement in five different churches of Santa Cruz, California, and another message from the Chaplain of Stanford University saying: "The University has watched with much interest the progress of the People's Movement, and desires to make its contribution by inviting Dr. Oswald McCall, of Berkeley, to deliver a series of six addresses on peace at the University beginning next Sunday."

I have cited all of the above for the purpose of showing the practical tests that the People's Movement has undergone; and further to call attention to the fact that these tests have been real and earnest, not perfunctory or complimentary, and in every instance complete success and warm commendation has attended these tests. This encourages us to believe that there is merit in our movement, and that through it our community is enabled to put to practical service the instruction and information on the subject it has received to advance the cause of peace. In our own town of Palo Alto of 7,000 inhabitants we have more than 1,000 signed members of the People's Movement. Judging from the enthusiasm that exists in this city today for peace it is certain that were a vote to be held on a political question in which international peace were involved the opposers of peace methods would be utterly defeated.

Our work not only results in branches of the People's Movement being established, but also in the creation of keen interest in the minds of many in questions connected with peace who may not have joined the Movement. We have received requests from about twenty-five cities to visit them and establish branches, which we have not yet been able to do.

In Palo Alto the Mayor of the City has presided over two mass meetings of citizens gathered to discuss the People's Movement. The famous educator, David Starr Jordan, was the principal speaker at one of these mass meetings.

Our purpose is not only to advocate our own movement, but also wherever possible to create interest and give information and have kept in mind this matter of international peace. Within the last few months members of our movement have given twenty-five addresses

in a dozen different California cities, on the World Court, League of Nations and other subjects relating to peace.

We believe that our experiences demonstrate beyond the possibility of doubt that our Movement may be successfully established in every locality by the people themselves. There may be lethargy and lack of understanding at first, but this is certain to be replaced by enthusiasm. I will end my remarks with a question. Is the People's Movement for International Peace a logical, effective, and desirable answer as far as its particular mission is concerned, to the work of instruction done by the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches? Does the World Alliance feel that good results should naturally be expected from the work of the People's Movement? In the light of our experience in California, can there be any doubt of the success of organising a People's Movement for International Peace in every community throughout our country? And if such movements are everywhere organised, can there be any doubt that their combined power for war prevention in this country would be irresistible?

VIII

EFFECTIVE COMMUNITY ACTION

JACOB GOLDSTEIN,*

Rabbi, Temple Anshé Emeth, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

I CRAVE your pardon while I indulge in a brief personal reference. During the war, I served in the A. E. F. as a clerical welfare worker, for over eight months in the camps in this country and for about six months in France—the greater part of my time being spent in hospital wards. In Paris, I had for awhile to visit sick and wounded American lads in eleven different hospitals. I saw our suffering boys by thousands—a very small percentage of the total sick and hurt, certainly, but quite enough to leave an ineffaceable impression on my mind. My memory is haunted by their horribly mangled forms, in some instances; by their wan and worn faces in most cases. My heart is uplifted when I recall their stout-hearted cheerfulness and the bright eyes with which every one of them looked into the face of death. *But I never want to see the effects of war again.*

Thus, when last year, I received a circular let-

* It is in deference to Rabbi Goldstein's special request that the earlier part of his address is omitted. It was historical and picturesque, but wholly oral, and no stenographic record was made.

ter from the World Alliance in New York, asking me to devote a service to the advocacy of world peace, my instant reaction was a determination to comply with the request. I had not, so far as I can recall, received any previous communication from the Alliance. I dare say that they had confined themselves to the Christian clergymen or had not, before that time, got my name and address.

After the service I paid a visit to the office in New York in order to secure fuller information about the aims and methods of the organisation. I was received with the utmost courtesy and in a real fraternal spirit. Information was cheerfully afforded me and I came away not only gratified at the reception accorded to me, but also filled with admiration for the organisation, its aims and achievements.

Turning the matter over in my mind, I resolved that it was my personal duty to form a local branch in New Brunswick, N. J., where my congregation is.

Mind, this had not been requested of me. It was my own answer to the question of my conscience. I called on two of my non-Jewish colleagues (I had been little more than a year in the place), whom I had the good fortune to have met. They brought in others. Five of us met together and resolved that we could form a local branch.

In the end, after a couple of months' quiet work, we organised the New Brunswick branch of the W. A. I. F. Practically every clergyman of every shade of faith was enrolled. Protestants of all denominations, Roman Catholic, Greek Catholic and Jewish organisations were represented.

Here are some of the figures from the World Almanac for 1922:

	Protestants	*Catholics*	*Jewish*
North America	43 millions	37 millions	3.5 millions
South America	1 million	36 millions	.115 millions
Europe	96 millions	210 millions	10.9 millions
Totals	140 millions	282 millions	14.5 millions

If we were to form a *World* Alliance for Peace, can we ignore Catholics and Jews?

The following statement of how we organised our Branch may prove interesting. It is quoted from a statement I drew up at the request of the New York body and published by them:

"I was entrusted with the task of drafting the constitution of the new branch which (after submission to a special committee) was adopted by the main body. The branch was to have a dual form. The first was to comprise every clergyman in the city and its vicinity, and its ranks were always to be open to admit others who might desire to enter. This ministerial body—while always ready to act with, and for the time, to merge itself for all purposes, into the second and larger corps to be organised—remained a substantive unit with power to act independently at any time that such a course was deemed desirable. This might be viewed as a branch of the 'Church Peace Union.'

"The larger body was to consist of all these clergymen *plus* men and women of the laity. Each minister was to nominate six members of his congregation—three males and three females—for membership in this composite body. In addition, all other desirable citizens of either sex who could be induced to join, were to be enrolled. This was to become the local branch of the American Branch of the 'World Alliance for International Friendship.' It was to have its own organisation of officers, selected by itself—with one important exception.

"A basic principle laid down by the founders was that the organisation was always to remain absolutely aloof from all party-politics or class-partisanship. Partly to

secure this aim and partly to keep the two wings—cleric and laity—in constant and sympathetic union, it was enacted that the clergyman who was, for the time being, president of the ministerial body should also, during his incumbency, be president of the larger body. All other officers, of either wing, were to be elected independently."

Here is how I expressed my view of the goal we aimed at:

"Our aims are to align the best minds in our community with the great organisations, in this country and abroad, which are striving to foster a world-wide sentiment for peace. America cannot afford to hold itself aloof from this movement. What, as a political entity, America may decide to do is a thing somewhat apart from our purview. But what all God-fearing Americans of both sexes and every social grade may rightly do to strengthen and encourage their like in all lands we shall, God willing, earnestly strive to do."

I proffered my services to form branches in three cities neighbouring my own: Trenton, Elizabeth and Perth Amboy. There would be, I knew, a great deal of expenditure for railway and car fares, telephoning, etc., in connection with the effort. This expenditure was provided and I devoted a good deal of time and effort to found the three branches.

I am firmly convinced that there exists a wide-spread approval of the proposal that the common-sense of the whole world should be organised to do, in the future, what all the statesmen in the world have failed to do in the past—to preserve peace by the application of a spirit of international brotherhood and sense of justice. I am convinced that if America sets the fashion, the movement will soon become world-wide. I am convinced that a very little organised action will see vigourous branches spring up all over this land—and I am convinced that the action should begin at once.

PART II
INSTRUMENTS

IX

A CONSTRUCTIVE PROGRAM

MARY E. WOOLLEY,

President, Mount Holyoke College, Mass.

"A CONSTRUCTIVE program for peace"—it is an inspiring subject brought for our consideration. This is not a time to deplore the world situation and condemn the Church for not redeeming it. Rather it is a time, if ever there was one, for the positive, not the negative, for action, not for condemnation.

There are certain definite obligations presented to the Church, and perhaps the first is to face the facts. In America today there is a strange indifference which is nothing less than lethargy. The horrors of a possible "next war" need to be driven home, that the American public may be startled awake from their smug complacency and made to see the awfulness of the abyss on whose edge the world is swaying. A recent article in the *Fortnightly Review* was written not by an alarmist trying to frighten the world, but by a scientist and inventor, whose work during the World War was highly valued by the British War Inventions Board. Among the things he expects to play a part in future warfare are:

Jets of water, charged with electricity, to kill horses and men.

Wireless telephony, sight, heat, power and writing.

Wireless control of tanks and airplanes.

Battle plane engines developing wireless power to destroy aircraft within hundreds of yards.

Wireless heat to destroy European regions.

Giant transport airplanes with incredible speed.

Secret war plans ferreted out by wireless telephone and sight, the future war's eyes and ears.

Propaganda striking terror into every home by means of wireless receivers, which will be more common than any telephone today.

Armoured boats, capable of diving under the water and of flying in the air, a kind of combined tank-submarine airplane.

Airplanes with electric impulse, their guns firing an enormous number of bullets a second.

Electrically controlled rockets, operated on wires for wrecking planes.

A wireless controlled torpedo with wireless sighted periscope, controlled by a secret combination of wave lengths.

Gyroscopic, wireless airplanes over which operator, who may also be in sight, has absolute control and can release bombs at will.

It is not necessary to picture a possible future; the present is sufficiently appalling. Dr. Nansen, scientist, explorer and High Commissioner of the League of Nations, is today warning us that Europe is now, five years after the armistice, in worse condition than in 1918 at the end of the War, and that the only possibility of reconstruction lies in international co-operation.

The Christian Church must also face the fact that she is under fire, as an effective agency, a vital power in the life of humanity. Not, perhaps, that the Church as an organisation would go out of existence if she failed

to meet this test as a power for world friendship. But to exist is not all. No more awful judgment was ever passed than that recorded in the Book of the Revelation. "And unto the angel of the Church in Sardis write; These things saith he that hath the Seven Spirits of God, and the seven stars; I know thy works, that thou hast a name, that thou livest, and art dead."

There are in this audience many who are deeply interested in different forms of effort, for human welfare, social, missionary, religious. Do we realise how inextricably all such effort is bound up with a new internationalism, how futile—how impossible its development, its existence will be unless world politics are based on a different principle? Five months in China two years ago sent me home thrilled with the opportunity of our day to develop in the Far East a modern civilisation based on Christian idealism, in its industries, in its social life, even in its politics. But the realisation of that ideal is absolutely dependent upon a new international spirit, the spirit of sympathy, and insight, co-operation and good will and love.

If that new spirit fails to come, what then? What then! There is a favourite picture in New China. I saw it often on the walls of school rooms, I have it at home, painted for me by a student in a private school in Soochow, a picture of China Awakening, a lion roused from slumber, alert, poised, muscles taut, head thrown back, every line of the body indicative of power. It is a picture full of meaning, meaning ominous in the light of the old internationalism, full of promise, in the light of the new.

It is not necessary to go to the Far East to point this moral. All my life I have known of the missions of the American Board in the Near East, the millions of dol-

lars invested in schools and colleges and churches; the hundreds of trained lives given to the development of the work; the wealth, material, intellectual, spiritual, lavished upon it. And now? Buildings in ruin; wholesale massacres of Christians; life worse than death for the survivors; the work of more than a generation wiped out. If this government had taken the responsibility of a mandate for that part of the world, this overwhelming catastrophe would never have come.

It is not necessary to go afield to see the connection between a new internationalism and efforts for human uplift. The effort for aliens in our midst, social work of every description, the attempt to build up for the foreigner in our midst with the one hand, while with the other we are utilising all the resources of science and invention to destroy their brothers across the sea and to wipe out the civilisation of which they are a part. How futile, how much worse than futile, is such a contradiction!

This inconsistency strikes at the very roots of our religions, turns into hollow mockery the words of our preachers—For all ye are brethren and one is your father.

There are thousands of Christians in this country who are committed heart and soul to this program for a new international relationship. Christian organisations have put themselves on record, as the Federal Council of Churches; but not yet has the world been made to feel that the Church which bears the name of Christ has set itself like a rock against the massacre of humanity and civilisation which we call " War."

Two paragraphs were before me as I thought of this subject, both, as it happens, written by women.

One of them writes: "The causes of war—greed, misunderstandings, suspicions, aggression—will always continue to create disputes. The causes of duelling exist today just as much as in the days of Thackeray's eighteenth century heroes who fought a duel every time they were insulted. But duelling is now a crime and duelling has ceased. War must be made a crime likewise. Disputes will continue, but be settled by law, not war, as soon as nations choose to have it so."

The other says: "So often it seems as though the solutions offered by the followers of Christ for the tangled affairs of the world are in terms of machinery rather than in terms of vital life-giving forces which Christians, above all, should know how to use."

Both are right—there must be the machinery. "A world organised for peace is very different from a world organised for War." Above all, there must be the spirit, the "dynamic spirit of Jesus loosed in the world."

There must be the machinery. And the machinery, the organisations are at hand and at work. We have a constructive program, at Geneva an organisation which for three years has been engaged in building up after four years and more of tearing down, a League of Nations which is functioning. It has prevented at least three, probably four, wars; it has come to the rescue of bankrupt Austria; it has repatriated 400,000 prisoners, from Russia; it has interested itself in the labour problem and through its labour department is working to humanise labour throughout the world; it is wrestling with great international problems, disease, opium, traffic in women and children. In the Greco-Italian affair, "it was the moral force of the League that forced Italy to submit the difficulties to an inter-

national body," says so eminent an authority as Dr. Nansen. Mr. Colby, in his address delivered in this city last month, shows by a careful and exhaustive study of the situation, that "Had there been no League of Nations, Greece would have been forced to fight or submit to a shameful and humiliating surrender of her sovereignty." Mr. Colby adds: "There is no doubt in my mind whatever, had the dispute passed through the old diplomatic channels, that Greece, stung by a charge of cowardice and dishonour, would have committed some act of violence and been plunged into war, in spite of her military weakness. This is not my opinion only, but the opinion of Prime Minister Baldwin of Great Britain, who made the following statement before the Imperial Conference yesterday: 'I consider that the members of the Council of the League deserve the greatest credit for having placed the permanent interests of peace above what might have seemed the immediate interests of the League itself. And in this moderation they have been amply justified. There is no single person possessing real knowledge of the recent crisis, or any similar settled experience in the past who does not realise today that had the League not existed and acted as it did, a resort to arms would almost inevitably have taken place, and that had the Council of the League of Nations not shown a wise discretion, for which in some quarters they have been assailed, the outcome of the crisis might have been very different.' There was no war, however. Greece was not driven to arms. She had the League to which she could go, and instead of being dishonoured in the eyes of the world for not fighting, she was honoured for keeping her pledge not to fight. Is it not fair, therefore, to hope, and reasonable to claim, that the

League of Nations prevented another war with all its attendant horrors and suffering?"

The League is not the only constructive program before us. There are men in this audience who can speak with authority on the Permanent Court of International Justice; who can show how peculiarly it is the realisation of an American ideal, our nation having had "a conspicuous place in the advocacy of such an agency of peace and international adjustment," to quote from President Harding's message of last February. "It is well known to many of us that the American delegation to the first Hague conference, in 1899, was instructed by President McKinley and Secretary Hay to act upon 'the long-continued and widespread interest among the people of the United States in the establishment of an international court,' and to propose a plan for an international tribunal to which the nations might submit 'all questions of disagreement between them, excepting such as may relate to or involve their political independence or territorial integrity.'"

"In 1907, the American delegates to the second Hague Conference were instructed by President Roosevelt and Secretary Root to work for the development of the Permanent Court of Arbitration 'into a permanent tribunal composed of judges who are judicial officers and nothing else, who are paid adequate salaries, who have no other occupation, and who will devote their entire time to the trial and decision of international causes by judicial methods and under a sense of judicial responsibility.'"

This plan was never put into force; if it had been, the world might have been saved from the calamity of the last ten years. The Council of the League of Nations was the agency for putting into effect the man-

date in Article 14 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, inviting "a group of distinguished jurists to frame a plan for the new Court," Mr. Root, representing the United States in this group of ten, suggesting as a basis of discussion the plan for a Permanent Court of Arbitral Justice drawn up at the second Hague Conference.

Mr. Hudson, in his Historical Notes on the Permanent Court, says: "The new Permanent Court of International Justice is thus firmly established; its judges command the respect and confidence of governments and peoples throughout the world; a hopeful beginning of its work has been made; and it seems not too sanguine to think that a future of great usefulness lies before it. The Government of the United States had no part in the final steps of establishing it, and is not today contributing in any way toward its support. But President Harding, in his message of February 24, 1923, has proposed that the United States shall join with the other nations in maintaining it, and when that step shall have been taken it should greatly strengthen the prestige and position of the new Court.

"It now seems possible to say that a new milestone has been laid on the road from war to peace, and that a big advance has been made toward the substitution of law for force.

"The Government of the United States had no part in the final steps of establishing it, and is not today contributing in any way towards its support." My friends, how long are we willing to have that indictment written across our national history? How long are we willing to have no part in this substitution of law for force? How long are we willing to weaken this world agency for promoting justice and averting

war, by failing to co-operate and thus throwing our vast influence against it? There is no getting away from that;—we cannot be "neutral" on the subject of world peace. We are either for it or against it;—there is no middle road.

We have been assured again and again that it is logical and safe and sane for us to enter the Permanent Court. I sometimes wish that that emphasis were not so strong. Is it not a lasting shame to us as a people that we demand the assurance that it is safe for us to lend a hand for the salvation of the world? Not always have we been a timid people, cautious to a point where caution becomes curiously akin to cowardice. On the contrary, we have been proud of our willingness to do and to dare.

All my life I have lived in the neighbourhood of factory towns, have heard much talk about machinery, its necessity, its effectiveness, its improvement. But machinery is driven by power. Is it true that in the solutions for the tangled affairs of the world we think too exclusively in terms of machinery and forget the vital, life-giving forces which we, as Christians, should know how to use? From the Orient comes a challenge to the Christians of the West. "Nowadays religion seems to be ruled by social movements, instead of guiding, commanding and inspiring them," writes Masaharn Anesaki, of Tokyo Imperial University. Guided, commanded, inspired by the spirit of Jesus Christ, that we, His professed followers, may guide, command, inspire that international friendship which alone can save the world.

X

A WORLD ECONOMIC CONFERENCE

OSCAR S. STRAUS,

Formerly United States Ambassador to Turkey.

WE are assembled under the auspices of the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches, not as partisans in politics, nor as sectarians in religion, but as Americans faithful to our traditions to further the best and highest interests of our country and of the world. As Americans who have never been defeated in war, we have ever stood for peace, the peace of righteousnss, to secure which we have never counted the cost or withheld the sacrifices of blood and treasures we were called upon to make.

Lloyd George, in his last speech before leaving our shores, said: "It is easier to make war than to make peace. Those who make war, whether they are individuals or nations, cannot escape the responsibilities of peace." That this is our belief is proven by our assembly here tonight. It required no such Congress to arouse the American people to take their part in the World War, and while it took us two and a half years to take our part in the war, already five years have elapsed since the Armistice, and we have not taken our part in world peace. Under the guidance of the God of nations, we shall not, however, cease our efforts until the United States shall have discharged her responsi-

bilities to her dead, and to the living, to bring about world peace. It becomes every day clearer that until we do take our proper part, there will be no peace.

There comes a time in crises when partisanship with its checks and balances paralyses political actions, and when the people stirred by great moral issues have to assume leadership to make their will felt. It is always a slow and difficult process, but a basic process, by which democracy makes known its will. Such a crisis confronts us now; it was partisanship, yes, partisanship in our Senate, that prevented us from discharging our responsibilities for securing peace. We must, therefore, carry on and arouse and make articulate the enlightened sense of our people, of the men and women of America, to give their mandate to the President and to Congress, which our statesmen will not be at a loss to interpret, and our politicians will not have the unwisdom to disregard.

The trouble with our relations to the program of world peace has been from the beginning, even before the Versailles Treaty reached our Senate; the group of its opponents became violently articulate in the last Administration, and threateningly articulate in this. The same vociferous tactics are now being employed against our associating ourselves with the International Court of Justice as well as with the Hughes late proposal for an Economic Commission.

The question before us for discussion is the same that is before the trembling world, A Constructive Program for Peace. Unless prompt and effective action is taken, the destructive forces in Germany, Russia, and throughout most central European states, will have advanced so far that no remedial measures can be of avail. Hunger, desperation and civil war, unless ar-

rested, will plunge what is left of civilisation into a dark and fathomless abyss of chaos and despair. Our country can no more isolate herself from the after-war problems of construction than she could isolate herself from the war problems in 1917. The world looks to America for leadership, and unless we take the leadership that enlightened self-interest demands, we cannot escape the disaster that threatens to engulf the civilised world.

Europe owes us ten billion dollars. With the exception of Great Britain, that debt is of little value, and grows less day by day. Every competent observer, familiar with European conditions, almost without exception, states that another world war is in the making. Even Hiram Johnson, on his return from Europe, said another world war was approaching. Lloyd George emphasised, again and again, war was not only approaching, but was very near. Therefore, by scaling down our debt, or even wiping it out altogether upon suitable conditions, if thereby we can prevent another world war, I maintain even from an economic point of view, it would be a good investment; and from a humane point of view it would be a most beneficent blessing. For us, therefore, to summon an economic advisory commission with the limitation that Europe's debt to us should not be even discussed, would, as it has, naturally encourage, if not impel, France to do likewise and condition her acceptance upon even more drastic terms.

While the Hughes proposal for an advisory economic commission with its limitations might have been characterised as a step forward, it was at best, a lock-step; and, of course, with a counter lock and chain step on the part of France, no progress would have been made

and precious time would have been lost. It is not to be regretted, therefore, that this attempt has broken down. The question, therefore, presents itself, what can be done. To my mind, the answer is plain. The Versailles Treaty, whatever may be its qualities or its defects, whether it has been a failure, as even one of its greatest protagonists, Lloyd George, stated it was, is a conclusion which many circumstances seem to largely support. How far our refusal to be associated with the treaty, in any form, has contributed to its weaknesses, may be left out of consideration at this moment. The fact is, the treaty was never framed to meet such conditions as now confront Europe and the world. The problem is only secondarily international, and primarily intranational.

The immediate remedy is economic, no less in France than in Germany and in other European states. As Secretary Hughes said in his New Haven speech, " We cannot dispose of these (economic) problems by calling them European, for they are world problems, and we cannot escape the injurious consequences of our failure to settle them." This is a wise and profound statement.

Lord Robert Cecil said, and as the last war proved, and all history teaches, when war begins no one can limit its extent. But it is claimed that such nations as would likely begin a war, notably Russia and Germany, are too poor to launch another war. The answer is that hunger, poverty and resultant discontent instead of being preventatives of war, are the most provocative causes of war. The world is sick unto death. To call in experts and limit their functions by excluding an examination of the allied debts and of the amount of reparations, to exclude the examination of the heart and lungs of the patient, precludes not only a correct

diagnosis, but also a possible remedy. The conditions that confront us today are as urgent as they were in 1917. The allied nations, only a degree less than the rest of Europe, are no nearer to a solution of after-war conditions than they were to victory when America answered their urgent call for help. America furnished the solution then, and it alone, with Great Britain co-operating, can furnish the solution now.

Signor Nitti, former Italian Prime Minister, and one of Europe's foremost statesmen, says: "There is nothing to do but to shatter the chains of error and violence. America must exert economic and moral pressure in order that Europe may be reconstructed,—she can impose peace as she imposed victory." He says further: "A loyal co-operation between the two great Anglo-Saxon countries, the United States and Great Britain, would swiftly restore the world to equilibrium." The remedy lies not in hugging our isolation by doing nothing to break the forces of chaos, but in doing something, and doing something quickly.

On December 29, 1922, Senator Borah submitted an Amendment to the Naval Appropriation Bill, calling for a world economic conference, which he reluctantly withdrew so as not to embarrass the Administration plan for the limited economic conference, to which I have referred, and about which "conversations" were then going on. Now that the limited economic conference is broken down, the necessity of conditions and the logic of circumstances induce and impel me to bring to your attention and to the attention of the country, the wisdom for the Administration to take up the Borah Plan, and in conjunction with Great Britain, and with such other nations as may be induced to join, invite representatives from all the nations, allied, neutral and

former enemy nations, to a conference without economic limitations to discuss and consider problems of peace and reconstruction. This, in my judgment, is not only the logical, but the most constructive, plan for world peace.

The objection may be urged, how can such a conference take place without the consent of France. The answer is, how can France, our ancient friend and ally, refuse to participate in such a conference. Finally, such a conference is in accord with the pledges contained in the platform of the Republican Party, and with President Harding's repeated pledges as a candidate and when President, favouring an Association of Nations.

XI

A WORLD COURT—NEED AND PURPOSE

A. LAWRENCE LOWELL, LL.D.,

President, Harvard University.

NO civilised state could exist without courts of law. Disputes constantly arise between its citizens, and between bodies of citizens representing divergent interests or different localities, such that without impartial tribunals to decide them there would be constant recurrence to violence to obtain what the parties firmly believe to be their rights. No country is, of course, free from crimes, but with courts supported by public confidence the resort to violence to enforce claims, or redress supposed injuries, practically disappears.

The authority of courts of law has been especially prominent in English-speaking countries. The reason for this may be traced far back in the history of England. The government there became centralised, or national, much earlier than in the rest of Europe, at a time when the feudal system was in full force upon the Continent. In England that centralisation was the work of the Norman and Angevin Kings, and their chief tool for bringing it about was the institution of the King's court, whose members, by more enlightened methods of trial, and by going on circuit about the country, gradually brought all important questions within their jurisdiction. Hence in England alone there

grew up a national jurisprudence, known as the Common Law, strong and highly developed enough to resist the impact of the Roman Law which overwhelmed the local law in every other European state.

The royal or common law became indeed so strong as to restrain the King himself. Writing of Magna Carta in their book on the History of English Law, Pollock and Maitland remark "in brief it meant this, that the King is and shall be below the law." Hence the famous saying that the wind and rain may enter the poor man's house, but the King cannot enter; and in this connection it is noteworthy that Magna Carta insisted upon the royal duty of sending the justices on circuit through the land. Professor Dicey, in his Law of the Constitution, pointed out that acts of Parliament, and in fact of the customs and conventions of political action, rest ultimately on the authority of the courts for their enforcement; a fact more picturesquely stated long ago by Hume. "Man," he says, "is engaged to establish political society in order to administer justice; without which there can be no peace among them, nor safety, nor mutual intercourse. We are, therefore, to look upon all the vast apparatus of our government, as having ultimately no other object or purpose but the distribution of justice, or, in other words, the support of the twelve judges. Kings and parliaments, fleets and armies, officers of the court and revenue, ambassadors, ministers, and privy-councillors, are all subordinate in their end to this part of administration."

The Common Law was never formally enacted here. Our forefathers brought it over with them, because they could not do otherwise. It was the foundation stone of all their political and social institutions. It

was an integral part of their traditions, and with it they brought their respect for judicial tribunals as a means for the peaceful settlement of controversies. The principle was brought to its culmination in the Supreme Court of the United States. Just now it is the fashion to criticise that body, and perhaps it is fair to assume that its decisions have not always been right, because it would be a supernatural body if they were. But taken all in all it is perhaps our greatest contribution to the art of government.

With such an inheritance of traditions, with such a development of them here, it is natural that Americans should desire to have international disputes settled by a court. Hitherto we have prided ourselves as a people upon our advocacy of international arbitration. Mr. Hughes has told us that prior to the first peace conference at the Hague, in 1899, the United States had participated in fifty-seven arbitrations; and when the Hague Conferences seemed to open a door for a more stable and systematic organisation of justice among nations the United States urged, in 1899 and 1907, the creation of a true international court composed of definite judges. Every one of the last five presidents favoured it; but all that could be obtained at the Hague was the Permanent Court of Arbitration, not a court in our sense, because not a permanent body of judges, but a list of eminent jurists from which the parties might select arbitrators for a particular case. At last a real court has been organised, largely by the wisdom, tact, and capacity for conciliation, of an eminent American, Hon. Elihu Root. Among its eleven members is another citizen of the United States, Mr. John Bassett Moore. It has been in session, and has already decided a number of questions. In doing so it has shown abil-

ity, independence and impartiality, the qualities that a good court ought to possess. The creation of this tribunal is in accord with American traditions, its framework has been devised largely by an American lawyer and statesman in harmony with American ideas, and one would have supposed that the American people would have been quick to join it with enthusiasm. Yet it is opposed by men who claim to be actuated by a particularly strong American spirit.

A number of criticisms have been directed at the Permanent Court of International Justice, some of them because it cannot do things which no court can ever do. People say that it cannot stop wars or outlaw war. The Supreme Court of the United States did not prevent the Civil War, nor could it have done so; but it has settled many questions that might otherwise have led to civil strife, and so will the Permanent Court of International Justice. People say also that its decisions cannot be enforced, but already they have been, and hereafter will be, accepted by the nations concerned. No decision of a question by arbitration is enforceable, yet we should deny our principles if we denied that the awards of international arbitrators have been, and probably always will be, faithfully carried out.

I think it no exaggeration to say that criticisms of this kind would never be made if it were not for an objection that lies in the minds of many of our fellow-citizens, the connection of the Court with the League of Nations. But in the first place,—except for the method of electing the judges—the Court is independent of the League, which has no control over it or over its members. As these are chosen for nine years it is extremely improbable that a desire for re-election

by the League would affect the opinion of a member, even if he were so unjudicial in character as to be open to such a motive. The League, indeed, is curiously limited in its choice. The candidates are nominated by the national groups in the Hague Court of Arbitration—a body of distinguished jurists scattered over the world—and only in case a majority in the Council and Assembly fail to agree upon selections from the list of candidates so presented can the League elect anyone outside of that list. Since the United States is already a party to the Court of Arbitration her representatives there can, and this year actually did, make nominations for the Court of International Justice. If, then, this Court is really independent of the League, why should our country object to taking in the election of the judges? Because it would virtually make us a member of the League? Obviously that is not so. By joining in the election of judges we assume no obligations under the Covenant; we take no further part in the proceedings of the Council or Assembly. But, it is said, this is a step toward joining the League. Not unless the American people want to do so, and if they should desire to join the League it would be unwise for anyone to try to prevent them. But, whatever the advantages of the Court, the League seems to be regarded by some people as such an evil thing that we must keep clear of any contact with it; one cannot touch pitch, they think, without being defiled. Is that rational? Is it good sense to look upon the League as something to be shunned like the plague?

The poor League has been treated in a way most extraordinary for clear-sighted Americans. The Covenant has been misinterpreted until many people in the United States have the most vague and distorted notion

of its provisions. The League has been called a superstate, which it never was. The Council, with its modest advisory functions, and the Assembly, little more than a forum for the free debate of international interests, have been magnified by orators into overlords of national sovereignty. The questions of peace on earth, and of our own interest in world order, are too serious to be treated in this way. We must consider them earnestly and with an open mind, not by preconceived prejudice or from a party standpoint. The League is neither a panacea nor a trap to entangle us in foreign broils. It has its uses which may be ours; but, whatever may be our attitude toward the League, a world court, which we have always desired, is certainly not to be abandoned by us because the only possible court of that nature, so far as we can now see, is elected through the instrumentality of the League. It has been suggested that the Court might be self-elected, by filling its own vacancies. The only comment needed upon such a plan is to ask whether the American people would for a moment tolerate a proposal that the Supreme Court of the United States should be self-perpetuating.

The objection to the League most commonly heard, and the one that appears to have taken the strongest hold upon the imagination of our people, is that the British Empire has six votes to our one,—now seven, since Ireland has been admitted to membership in the League. It may be interesting to observe what these seven votes really mean, and whither our lack of knowledge of what is going on in the outside world is leading us. When the Conference met in Paris at the close of the war, the premiers of the self-governing British Dominions signed a memorandum demanding that the Dominions should be signatories of the treaty

of peace, which would thus record the status attained by them, adding "The Crown is the Supreme Executive in the United Kingdom and in all the Dominions, but it acts on the advice of different ministries within different constitutional units; and under Resolution IX of the Imperial War Conference, 1917, the organisation of the Empire is to be based upon equality of nationhood." In accordance therewith these Dominions, including India, which is aspiring to self-government, were admitted to the League on the basis of internationally independent states. What this meant in their eyes is shown by a cablegram from General Smuts, the premier of the Union of South Africa, to Mr. Meighen, the premier of Canada, at the time of the Conference on naval disarmament at Washington, as follows:

"Pretoria, October 19, 1921.

"I notice from press that you are sending representative to Washington Conference. I do not know whether you have received invitation from United States through British Government or otherwise. Would very strongly urge that you should press for such invitation before sending delegate. United States did not ratify peace treaty to which we are signatories as component independent states of British Empire. On the contrary, agitation in Congress against our independent voting power in League Nations was direct challenge to new Dominion status. This is first great international Conference after Paris, and if Dominions concerned are not invited and yet attend, bad precedent will be set and Dominion status will suffer. If a stand is made now and America acquiesces, battle for international recognition our equal status is finally won."

On this occasion the Dominions did not secure from the United States the recognition of their international status which they desired; but another opportunity was presented this year by the negotiations for a treaty to

provide a closed season in the halibut fishery off the Pacific coasts of the United States and Canada. The government of the Dominion desired to assert the right of Canada to make by itself, in its own right, treaties affecting its own interests; and therefore insisted that this treaty should be signed only by its own representative, the British Ambassador taking no part. After some objection by the Foreign Office in London the British Government finally yielded. Thus, to the joy of the other Dominions, the treaty-making power demanded by Canada was conceded by England; and the treaty was duly signed only by Mr. Lapointe and Secretary Hughes. But the right to make a treaty independently cannot be obtained without the consent of the country with which it is to be made, and when this treaty came before the Senate an understanding was appended "that none of the nationals and inhabitants and vessels and boats of any other part of Great Britain" should fish contrary to its provisions. The addition of this proviso necessitated a ratification of the treaty by the British Government in London instead of by Canada alone; and hence for the third time the United States, and for the second time the Senate, in effect refused to recognise the international status claimed by the British self-governing Dominions. There is something comical in the spectacle of the Senate, quite unconsciously, upholding the concentration of authority in the British Empire, and preventing the Dominions from obtaining a universal recognition of such international autonomy as they desire.

We are a generous nation. We have shown that we are not indifferent to the sufferings of other peoples. Let us think largely and boldly of the position in the world that our size and wealth has forced upon us.

Let us not abandon our own policy of the judicial settlement of international disputes because of the form, in itself of little consequence, in which our own idea of a world court has been embodied; but take our part therein for our own benefit and that of all the struggling peoples of the earth.

XII

THE WORLD COURT—METHOD AND APPLICATION

MANLEY O. HUDSON,

Professor, International Law, Harvard University.

WHEN the Senate meets next month, its order of business must include the proposal of President Harding, on February 24th of this year, that the United States give its support to maintaining the Permanent Court of International Justice. The proposal of President Harding was received by the Senate of the last Congress, and after a report by the Foreign Relations Committee it was decided that no action should be taken before adjournment on March 4th. But the proposal of President Harding did not expire with the adjournment of the 67th Congress. The Senate rules provide that "all proceedings on treaties shall terminate with the Congress, and they shall be resumed at the commencement of the next Congress as if no proceedings had previously been had thereon." President Harding's proposal is in form a request for the advice and consent of the Senate to the President's adhering to a treaty called the protocol of signature of the Permanent Court of International Justice.

The fulfillment of President Harding's hope would seem to be a step which the country would be inclined to take as a part of the Harding Memorial. I should

think that no better testimonial could be offered by the United States to the memory of our late President than to carry out the project with which his name became so prominently associated. Indeed, in the last speech that Mr. Harding delivered, he left no room for equivocation as to his own desire that this step should be taken.

President Harding, at St. Louis, enumerated two conditions which he considered indispensable to participation by the United States. First, that the tribunal should be "in theory and in practice, in form and in substance, beyond the shadow of a doubt, a world court and not a League court." Second, "that the United States shall occupy a plane of perfect equality with every other Power." I think they are conditions which, on their face, will appeal to most Americans. With the Court open on equal terms to all the states of the world, with Germany and Hungary appearing before it even prior to their admission to membership in the League of Nations, with a German judge sitting on the Court last winter for hearing the Wimbledon case, it is difficult for me to see how anyone can doubt the character of the Permanent Court of International Justice as a world tribunal. I should have thought it clear beyond even a "shadow of a doubt" that a Court whose statute has been formally accepted by forty-seven states, which is being financially supported by fifty-four states, whose judges may be nominated by any state which has accepted the Hague Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, in which any state of the world may appear as a litigant, is pre-eminently a world court.

The connection between the Court and the League makes it as clearly impossible to call the Court a League Court. There are four respects in which there is a

connection. First, the creation of the Court; second, the finances of the Court; third, the election of the judges; fourth, the giving of advisory opinions.

As to the creation of the Court, it is sometimes said that the Court is the creature of the League. In a sense this is true. For the Statute of the Court was originally drawn up by a Commission of Jurists appointed by the Council of the League, and the Statute was later approved by the Council and Assembly of the League. But the Court itself owes its existence, depends for its being, on no act of either of the bodies of the League of Nations or any of its organisations. The protocol of signature is a separate, distinct, independent treaty, forming no part of the Covenant, no part of the Treaty of Versailles.

As to the finances of the Court, the fifty-four members of the League now pay all of the expenses. The budget of the Court forms a separate part of the budget of the League of Nations. After a state pays its contribution to the Financial Director of the League, a percentage of the amount is ear-marked for the Court, and can be used for no other purpose. It is obviously an economical matter to use machinery already at hand for this purpose. The Financial Director of the League, Sir Herbert Ames, born in Massachusetts, though now a Canadian, acts as intermediary in collecting the money for the support of the Court.

In the third place, the judges are elected by the Council and Assembly of the League. But in electing the judges, these bodies act, not under the Covenant of the League, but as electoral bodies named in the Statute of the Court. Once the judges are elected, the Council and Assembly have no control over them and cannot remove them. This fact alone does not make the Court

a League tribunal, any more than the appointment of judges of the Supreme Court by the President makes the Supreme Court a presidential tribunal.

In the fourth place, the Council or Assembly representing the fifty-four members of the League, may ask advisory opinions from the Court. It is obviously necessary to place the judiciary of the world at the assistance of the agencies so nearly world-wide which deal with various disputes as they arise. This jurisdiction of the Court is based on an American model. Several of our states, notably Massachusetts, have provisions for the legislatures' asking the State Supreme Court for advisory opinions. I have never heard it suggested on this account that the Supreme Courts of these states were subordinated to legislative influence.

All four of the connections between the Court and the League leave the Court thoroughly competent to perform its service in an independent judicial way, leave the judges wholly free of personal influence, and make it possible for the United States to join in supporting the Court without in any way participating in the activities of the League of Nations.

I should have thought it abundantly clear, therefore, that the Court meets the first of President Harding's conditions. Indeed, this seems to have been his opinion at the time of his St. Louis speech, for he said that he was fully convinced of the excellence of the Court as now constituted. But for the sake of "harmonising opposing elements," for the sake of "giving consideration to our differences at home," Mr. Harding went ahead to outline a "readjustment of the existing arrangements with reference to the Court." He said that he was "not wedded irrevocably" to this readjustment, but submitted it "such as it is, without excess of detail,

as a basis for consideration, discussion, and judgment." I propose, therefore, because it has been greatly talked about, to give to his suggestions my consideration, discussion and judgment. Especially do I feel free to do this, because certain opponents of President Harding's February proposal are using his St. Louis speech as a basis for their contentions.

President Harding's suggested readjustment would effect three changes in:

1. The election of the judges.
2. The financial management of the Court.
3. The privilege of requesting advisory opinions.

As to the first of these proposals, President Harding suggested that the Court be made self-perpetuating, by empowering the members of the Court itself to fill any vacancy, either with or without the nomination by members of the Permanent Court of Arbitration. This suggestion would take from the Council and the Assembly of the League their functions with reference to the election of the judges, and would confer upon the judges themselves the entire power to choose their successors. The idea of a self-perpetuating court is something quite new in the history, not merely of international, but also of national jurisprudence. Complaint was made at the time of the French Revolution that the French courts had become self-perpetuating. I cannot conceive of anything more un-American than to confer on a small group of eleven men a power which no people have as yet been willing to confer in the administration of justice. It would smack of a degree of supergovernment which has never been suggested for any organ of the League of Nations. It would be difficult to imagine a more unpopular proposal than that the Supreme Court of the United States should be made

self-perpetuating. Yet it is more difficult to think of a self-perpetuating international court. We may assume that the judges of an international court would act in a high-minded way in choosing their successors. But in one respect they would be less well equipped than a national court for such a task. The justices of the Supreme Court of the United States would have the advantage, in exercising such a power, of acquaintance with a large number of the lawyers who argue before them. But the number of lawyers arguing before the International Court is very limited, and even if a judge were well acquainted with the lawyers of his own country, he would not be likely to know so well the international lawyers of other countries.

It is difficult for me to believe that the American people would ever consent to participating in a self-perpetuating court. But even if the American people would find the suggestion acceptable, the other peoples whose nationals are not today among the judges would undoubtedly object to it. Can anyone imagine this proposal being made by President Harding if the United States did not happen to have Judge John Bassett Moore among the judges? In view of the fact that for thirty years the effort to establish an international court was thwarted by the contest between the small Powers and the Great Powers, it would be difficult to think of a suggestion more unacceptable to the small Powers. To put it forward, the United States would be asking Peru, Haiti, and Siam to give up their voice in selecting the judges. The peoples of these small countries prize very highly the voice that they have now won. Last February President Harding and Secretary Hughes laid it down as essential that the United States have a voice in choosing the judges. But Mr. Harding's proposal for

self-perpetuation would deprive forty-three other nations of a voice which they now have. It would be difficult to imagine a proposal which would more effectively destroy the confidence which the countries now have in the Court than the proposal that it be made self-perpetuating.

What advantages would be expected from such a proposal? Surely no one could contend that the Court would be better able to discharge its functions, if it were self-perpetuating. Surely no one could contend that it would have a larger place in popular loyalty. The only advantage achieved would be the spiritual satisfaction which might be derived by American opponents of the League of Nations.

Moreover, this suggestion would disturb a delicate compromise which was reached by the Committee of Jurists in 1920 on the initiative of Mr. Root. Last February, Mr. Hughes stated that it would be "impracticable to disturb the essential features of the system" of electing the judges. If it would be impracticable to make an improvement in this system, it would certainly be impossible to make a change which cannot under any circumstances be called an improvement.

President Harding's second proposal related to the financial management of the Court. He proposed that the fixing of compensation of the judges, the control of expenditures, the apportionment of contributions, etc., be transferred from the League to either the Court of Arbitration or a Commission designated by the member nations. He pointed out that it would be an incidental feature of this proposal to "avert the admitted unfairness of the present system which imposes a tax upon members of the League who are not subscribers to the Court." Eight members of the League have not signed

the Court protocol, but none of them have made any complaint that they are asked to pay their share to the League, including a contribution to the expenses of the Court. If such unfairness exists, they do not avert it. It seems more probable that they consider that the advantage of having the Court and of voting in the Assembly in the election of the judges, compensates them for the obligation of payment. The incidental effect noted by President Harding presents no reason whatever for his proposal.

It is not possible to transfer the financial management of the new Court to the Court of Arbitration. This is based on a misconception as to what the Court of Arbitration is. It is not an organised body at all, it is merely a panel. It is possible that the administrative council composed of diplomatic representatives at The Hague could be given charge of the finances of the new Court, as they now have charge of the financial affairs of the old Permanent Court of Arbitration. But this would simply duplicate machinery which already exists for collecting money from the various governments of the world, and it would duplicate the work which is now being done to make the contributions to the League of Nations fairly apportioned and to have the expenditures economical and properly supervised. It has proved difficult to get a satisfactory method to apportion expenses of the League. It is no less difficult to keep the quotas paid up to date. Why should these international necessities be made more burdensome? For fifty-four peoples of the world the proposal has no more merit than a suggestion would have for Americans that there be a separate budget, a separate money-collecting agency, a separate financial administration for the Supreme Court of the United States.

The only possible advantages of this proposal for the United States would be that the United States would thus achieve a larger share in the control of the Court's finances. But if we desire this larger share, we can easily state a condition for our adhesion, supplementing those which Mr. Hughes has drawn. We could stipulate that the United States should be consulted in connection with managing the finances of the Court. In February, Mr. Hughes set as a condition that the United States should pay its fair share of the expenses. For this purpose, our money would not have to be paid to the Financial Director of the League of Nations. It could be sent directly to the registrar of the Court at The Hague.

President Harding's third proposal relates to the advisory opinions which the Court may be asked to give by the Council or Assembly of the League. President Harding suggested that the "exclusive privilege now held by the League to seek legal guidance from the Court might be extended to any member or group of member nations." It would be most unfortunate to abolish this function of the Court. The people who are now attempting to organise the peace of the world would not receive any such suggestion with hospitality. For in the task of international organisation it is inevitable that many questions of a constitutional nature will arise. These questions can only be handled smoothly and expeditiously if the Court may be called upon from time to time to straighten out the legal tangles. This was illustrated by the assistance which the Court has rendered by its first three advisory opinions to the International Labour Organisation.

Moreover, the fifty-four peoples who are attempting through international organisation to develop interna-

tional law along such lines as mandates and the protection of racial and religious minorities, will insist on maintaining in some form the Court's jurisdiction to give advisory opinions. The Court has already handed down two opinions in connection with the Minority Treaty of Poland. Here is a field, for instance, in which the diplomatic history of the United States is replete with instances which show the need of impartial judicial interpretation in non-contested cases. Many legal questions may arise in connection with the handling of political disputes by the Council or Assembly, with reference to which advisory opinions would be desired.

If the advisory opinions are not abolished, the President would have them extended so that any nation might ask for an advisory opinion. This is in effect what Finland attempted in connection with the East Karelian dispute. The opinion of the Court there shows how impossible it is for the Court to give advisory opinions at the request of a single state.

In one respect this jurisdiction of the Court might be extended. Advisory opinions might be given at the request of any international organisation, such as the Universal Postal Union, or the International Institute of Agriculture. Perhaps such a change as this could be effected simply by the Court amending its own rules.

All three of the readjustments suggested by President Harding would seem to be undesirable, impracticable, and unnecessary from any international point of view. They would not improve the present situation in any other way than by removing the objections of a few Americans based on a prejudice against the League of Nations.

Moreover, it would be extremely difficult to amend

the Statute of the Court. This Statute is an independent treaty which thirty-six states have ratified. The Council and Assembly of the League have no power to amend this Statute, nor does the Statute itself make any provision for amendments. The ordinary procedure for effecting any change, therefore, would require the consent of every party to the treaty, and such consent would have to be expressed through the treaty-making channels, so that a change in the Statute would require forty-seven states to put their treaty-making machinery into operation. For the most of the governments of the world this would require parliamentary action. It is a cumbersome procedure at best, and it involves great delay, even if it should succeed. Why should forty-seven states be put to the necessity of using their treaty-making machinery in order that the United States might remove certain objections to the use of its treaty-making machinery?

An amendment might be formulated through the organs of the League. But it is possible that a special international conference for this purpose would be necessary.

President Harding also suggested as a condition of American participation that the United States should occupy a plane of perfect equality with every other Power. He proposed no specific measures to this end in his "outline," but had in mind the removal of "the disparity in voting as between a unit nation and an aggregated empire which now maintains in the Assembly of the League." He was careful to add that he himself did not have any apprehensions about the existing situation.

By his vague insistence on equality, President Harding would seem to have demanded that steps be taken

to give the United States the same voting strength in the Assembly in connection with the election of judges as is enjoyed by all of the seven British peoples which are members of the League. In other words, the United States would be saying to Canada or to the Irish Free State something as follows:

"It is true that you have achieved a very independent position as a member of the British Commonwealth. After a generation of effort you have placed yourself in a position where you can exercise control over your own foreign policy and enjoy a real international status. But the United States does not propose to deal with you on this basis. The United States insists that all the British nations are one single unit. We insist that they must act together, vote together, and keep the historical character of a united empire."

Such a position does not at all correspond with the facts as to the relation between British peoples during the last four decades. The British dominions cannot be asked to give up their votes, nor can the United States ask extra votes in the Assembly which would not be given to other unit nations. The conception of an aggregated empire is wholly obsolete. Most of the British peoples are in fact and in truth independent and act independently.

What has the United States to fear from recognising this fact? In the Council of the League we would have one vote, as the British Empire has one vote, and we would be one of eleven. In the Assembly League, it is quite probable that the United States would support candidates for judgeships who would be supported by the British peoples. For we and they have a common system of law, and together we would be in a minority with reference to the countries which have a different

system of law. The United States would therefore be at no disadvantage in this respect in the election of the judges. We have everything to gain by the separate participation of the British dominions, and nothing to lose.

I come to the conclusion, therefore, that none of the suggestions by President Harding in his St. Louis speech contributed a basis for meeting difficulties which have arisen with reference to his proposal of February. The four conditions which were set by Mr. Hughes adequately took care of the American situation. In February, Mr. Hughes said it was impracticable to make any other readjustments. The situation has not changed since. It is still impracticable. The program put forward by President Harding in February is a straightforward, definite, thoroughly adequate program for safeguarding participation of the United States in the International Court. If the American people can understand the situation as it is, I am confident that the great majority of them will give support to this program, and its success can be achieved without any surrender to the irreconcilables who are attempting to confuse the facts about the present situation.

XIII

THE WORKING LEAGUE OF NATIONS

FRIDTJOF NANSEN, PH.D.

Director, Humanitarian Work Under the League of Nations.

I HAVE just crossed the ocean that separates two worlds, the Old World and the New World. That ocean at this moment, I am sorry to say, marks the boundaries between two worlds which are very different. The Old World is left behind like a ship sailing in a fog. It is sailing rough seas. The ship is waterlogged. The crews do not know where they are, or in what direction they are sailing, and the crews do not pull together.

The sea is rough, but there are even greater breakers ahead. The night is dark and no lighthouses to be seen. Even the stars of heaven seem to have disappeared, and they know there are sunken rocks in every direction. It is time, indeed, for wise men to stop to consider and to try to devise means and ways to avoid the danger. Unless serious attempts are made at reconstruction there is, indeed, real danger ahead in Europe —danger of war, and that war, if it comes some day, will be, unfortunately, much worse than the war which we have gone through, and all the sacrifices made during the last war will have been made in vain. Yet the view generally held in the world at this moment is certainly that war is absurd, is wicked, is

horrible. Nobody outside of a lunatic asylum will deny that.

During the last war nine million men were killed. It is more than the whole population of Canada. Thirty million men were wounded and maimed, equal to one-quarter of the population of the United States. Can you imagine the amount of suffering, of sorrow and grief that these figures actually represent in millions of families; but it is generally estimated that the number of lives lost by epidemic and diseases arising from the general conditions caused by the war was far greater than the number killed, and this we have to remember—the losses, the waste of human effort, and the gigantic waste represented by war debts.

A conservative estimate shows that the waste by the war debts represents something like fifty thousand million pounds, or two hundred and fifty thousand millions of dollars. Of every dollar of taxes paid today, sixty to eighty cents are due to the war. From an economic viewpoint, all of this lost expenditure has been perfectly unproductive. It could just as well have been thrown into the sea.

All of this is indeed a serious matter, but still incomparably less than the moral and intellectual loss and the damage arising from the war, which certainly is so enormous that it is incalculable. We must not, of course, forget the acts of heroism and sacrifice that were made during the war, and are always made during wars. Thank Heaven, in human affairs nothing is ever wholly bad. But when allowance is made for that, the balance against war economically, morally and intellectually is really overwhelming, and as I just said, the last war was terrible, much more terrible than any war had been before in the history of mankind, because the

knowledge of mankind had advanced so much during the years before the war; but we know that new inventions are made every day. And we know that the next war, if it really is to be, will be, unfortunately, much more terrible than the last.

Why should humanity be afraid of war? We have just lived to hear of an earthquake in Japan much more terrible than any earthquake we have heard of before. That was due to the forces of nature which we cannot control; but war—war is due to forces other than nature and certainly we ought to be able to control them. Is it really so that mankind shall suffer from monstrous evils of its own creation?

To me war resembles a creature, Gorgon-shaped. Its inventor finally succeeds in breathing life into it, and the creature stretches out its claw like a hand and strangles its maker. Yet, as I said before, there is at the present moment grave danger ahead—not tomorrow, nor the day after, perhaps, but some years hence—there is grave danger. The storm clouds are hanging over Europe at this moment. If attacked promptly they may be limited to local cyclones. If it is not done, a cataclysm as great as the Japanese earthquake may strike with its fury the whole of Europe.

Where are the storm centers? There are several of them. Many of us think that the most serious ones are at this moment in Russia. It is true Russia has gone through very dark times. It has passed through a dark era, more than most of the countries of Europe have passed through; first, owing to Russia's revolution —especially the Bolshevik revolution—and after that the terrible famine in 1921, when more people died than during any previous famine in Russia of which we know. Your people gave such unique help, when

you actually fed ten million people and saved them from starvation, and also when the European organisations did their little share and tried to help. If it had not been for the help given to Russia from the outside during that time the catastrophe would have been enormous. As it was, the suffering was very great indeed, and several million people died from starvation. But that belongs now to the past. There are still consequences of the famine, but Russia in this moment is recovering—slowly, it is true, but she is recovering. Her curve is now going upwards. She is developing, and I believe that we may live to see Russia again back as one of the main states of Europe, and she will perhaps help to save suffering Europe in some not too distant future.

But when we leave Russia and go westward we come to Poland. The Polish people were oppressed for generations by Russia on the one hand and by Prussia on the other. The population was debarred from gaining experience in government, and during the war the forces of the Russians and of the Germans went backwards and forwards over that unhappy country, and each succeeding wave of invasion was followed by a succeeding wave of devastation. Poland is a country rich in natural resources, but backward in development and burdened by poverty at this moment. There, certainly, is a place where there is a most vital need for goodwill, sympathy and friendly co-operation from other countries.

Let us turn to the other countries of Central Europe and the Balkan principalities. In all of these countries the frontiers were changed since the war—populations were changed and governments were changed. Jealousy and suspicion of their neighbours is common

amongst them and they are naturally nervous. Therefore, the remedy which is quite obvious here is to create goodwill between them and confidence between their neighbours. Here, more plainly perhaps than in any other part of Europe, the only hope and the only prospect for the future rests upon faith and willingness to co-operate, without which suffering and ruin will overtake these countries and will drag the other countries of Europe down with them.

If you take one of them, for instance, Hungary. You have heard about the desperate conditions in Hungary at this moment—financial and economic difficulties. By international co-operation it is certainly possible to save Hungary, the same way that Austria has been saved, and we are glad to know that the League of Nations has decided to try to do the same thing which it has done in Austria—to repeat that in Hungary and to help her out of her difficulties.

If you go southward in Eastern Europe, you find perhaps one of the worst, one of the darkest and most dangerous spots in Europe at this moment. That is Greece. Now you, perhaps, think that I am thinking of what happened in Greece during the last autumn—the conflict Greece had with Italy. As I understand it, that conflict has been little understood in this country, and I shall explain it in a few words. This great Italion conflict arose because five Italians happened to be murdered on Greek territory—five Italians belonging to the Boundary Commission that was sent out by the Ambassadors' Conference in Paris. That was a horrible crime—we do not know at this moment by whom it was committed—but it was natural to expect that it was done by Greeks, because there had been much friction between Greece and Italy during the time just

before it happened. We all very much regretted the crime, but, of course, it was doubtful whether the Greek nation as a whole could be made responsible for it, even if it could have been an act of revenge from some Greek subject, but we do not know whether that is correct.

As you know, Italy at once sent out an ultimatum to Greece—a very severe ultimatum—and followed that ultimatum by occupying Corfu, bombarding it while it made no resistance, and killing something like twenty innocent women and children. That was the trouble.

Greece at once made an appeal to the Ambassadors' Conference in Paris, whose commission had been murdered, and asked it to interfere and settle the question, and she declared herself willing to accept any decision which the Ambassadors' Conference would make. At the same time Greece also made an appeal to the League of Nations—to the Council of the League of Nations, to interfere and settle the disagreements between her and Italy, and she declared herself willing to accept any decision the League of Nations might make.

That was the situation. The Italians, however—at least Mussolini—said this was a question which concerned the national honour of Italy, and therefore Italy would not allow anybody to interfere, not even the League of Nations, nor the Ambassadors' Conference —that it had to be settled between Italy and Greece alone. The League of Nations did not pay any attention to that, but the Council took up the discussion at once, and strange to say the Italian representative also took part in the discussion, although Mussolini declared that the League of Nations had nothing to do with it, and consequently ought not to discuss it, but it was

discussed, and they also put forward a proposition for settlement. That proposition was also communicated, as an act of courtesy, to the Ambassadors' Conference in Paris. The day after that proposition had been made in the Council of the League a telegram arrived from Paris telling the Council that the Ambassadors' Conference had actually taken verbatim the proposal made by the Council of the League and made it its own proposition, and it was accepted by both parties—both Greece and Italy. Consequently, the difference between them was settled. That was, in fact, all that the League could ask for.

The League is in the world to try to keep peace, and if peace is established by somebody else it does not matter. The League ought not to be vain. As long as the question is settled, therefore, it ought to be of little importance who does it. Actual settlement of the differences between the two countries was certainly due to the League insofar that if it had not been for the League, it is perfectly certain that no settlement like that would have been arrived at; but anyhow, it was settled.

Nothing was said in the agreement about the occupation of Corfu. That might have been a matter for the League to take up, but before the League could take up that matter it should be also settled between the Powers and Italy. At any rate, Italy promised to evacuate Corfu on the 27th of September, but it made, in addition, a stipulation that if, on that date, it should turn out that Greece had not done her duty in trying to find the criminals, then Italy should have the right to keep the fifty million gold lira which Greece had agreed to deposit in a bank, to be used as indemnity for the killing of the Italians. That was also accepted by

Greece, and so far the League could not interfere, and Greece thought it was all right, because there was no danger but that she would do her duty in trying to find them. Then when the 27th of September came, Corfu was evacuated, but to the astonishment of many people in the world—I am sure to many in this country—the fifty million lira was handed over to Italy by the Ambassadors' Conference. Why, we do not know at this moment, because the report of the commission which had the matter in control has never been published. We do not know yet what that means, but at any rate, so long as the report has not been published it has not been proven that Greece did not do her duty. We all regret deeply that the position has been taken, but it is unjust to make the League responsible for that. The League, in fact, had no possibility of interfering when Greece had said before that she would take any decision made by the Ambassadors' Conference. That is the story.

I think it may be rightly said that during this affair the League has proved to be a great moral force in the world, a force which no great power will be able to neglect as not existing because, after all, Italy had to go back on her word and had to allow others to interfere and settle the dispute. But it was not of that matter I was thinking when I said that Greece is in difficulty at this moment.

The difficulty of Greece at this moment is the more than one million refugees thrown upon the Greek nation—the Greek people—during the military disaster in Asia Minor. Of all the people who have gone through suffering and hardship during the last twelve years of European history, I think no people has been exposed to a more terrible strain than the Greek people really

have. For ten years, with very short intervals, they have had continual wars, and most exhaustive wars. They have been fighting in Asia Minor and on the Peninsula, and it has been a tax on their resources which are, after all, very small. On top of that war and the overwhelming military disaster in Asia Minor last autumn, when the Greek state was shaken to its foundation, it took an enormous effort to pull themselves together, to assist and offer assistance during the peace negotiations. Then at this crisis—the worst crisis in Grecian history—it had thrown upon it,—(a people numbering less than four and one-half million) had thrown upon it in a few weeks an additional population of more than one million refugees from Asia Minor and from eastern Thrace.

You will understand what that means. The country was perfectly exhausted. The people in their ordinary circumstances had not enough to feed themselves. They must import and they had no credit to borrow abroad, and still they received all these refugees. Why? They were not Greek subjects, many of them could not speak Greek—they spoke Turkish. They were of the Greek race to a great extent, it is true, but many of them were not even of Greek race—they were Armenians—but they were all of them Christians, and when you asked the Greek government why, in its great difficulties, why it received these refugees it said, "If we did not open the doors they would have perished, and we had not the heart to say no." That is what the Greek people did. But how could they be fed? I say the resources in Greece were too small; they could not do it. We tried in Europe. The League of Nations at once took action. I was asked to go down and take care of them as far as we could. I went down, and we

also got several European organisations to help to feed them, and we threw in as much food as we could in a moment to save as many people as we could from death by starvation. But in that moment the American people came in and added a new chapter to their marvelous history of charity which they have written during the war and since the war—a charity activity which is so magnificent, so unique, there is nothing that can equal it in the whole history of humanity. They fed there during the winter something like eight hundred thousand refugees, but in the summer the American organisation had to stop because it saw that nothing was being done to save the situation permanently, and it thought it would not be well to continue because it would keep the people together instead of letting them go out and try to find work. It is absolutely necessary, of course, when people are dying from starvation to feed them and to help them, but on the other hand it is clear that that kind of charity work is not a solution of the problem, because when you stop feeding the people they have gone no further than when you began, unless they have got work in the meantime, and that is the difficulty. They saw we were trying to help them, that it was necessary. By the way, I may say that the League down there was not so much for feeding them, and we decided to divide the work between us. The Americans took charge of the feeding and the League took over the sanitary part of the work, and I may say, I think, without boasting too much, that the Epidemic Commission of the League did very good work indeed.

As an example, I think I may mention that the Epidemic Commission vaccinated 728,000 refugees to protect them against smallpox and other diseases, but we

saw clearly that the one great need was to try to settle these refugees in permanent work.

The greater part of them were agriculturists, and there is plenty of vacant land still in Greece or Greek territory, especially in eastern Thrace and Macedonia, but to settle the people on vacant land, even if you get the land for nothing, costs money, because the people must have equipment. They cannot cultivate the land with bare hands, and they must be fed while they are cultivating and waiting for the harvest. That meant great expenditure.

Work must also be found for the others. We saw that, and we had very little money, indeed, but we had a little, and we decided with what little money we had to make an experiment under the leadership of Colonel Proctor in Constantinople—to make an experiment with ten thousand refugees to try to settle them in permanent work to gain experience as to how the work ought to be done. These people were brought to western Thrace, distributed in the villages in that region. They occupied sheds during the autumn and winter while they were building their own houses, constructed from bricks made by themselves out of the local clay. They got land to cultivate. Many of them became agriculturalists, and those who had not brought animals with them from eastern Thrace received animals, seeds and agricultural implements from the Greek government, which helped in every possible way.

Others became fishermen, others brickmakers, others charcoal burners—that is the general fuel in that part of the world—the women carpet weavers from Asia Minor started the same trade on Greek territory, and we hope to have that trade developed. Some grow tobacco. Some have undertaken the silk industry.

They have planted sixty thousand mulberry trees, and they have, in fact, the greatest silk plantation in Europe at this moment.

I cannot begin to tell you all of the details, it would take too long, but to make a long story short I will tell you that in nine months these ten thousand people were made self-supporting and are supporting themselves now, so that instead of being a burden upon the Greek state their crops and their work now aid to strengthen the state.

In this way ten thousand people have been made productive citizens again, but there are one million left, and to settle them you, of course, need capital—money. Now the Greek government is very keen to have these people made productive again, and it is willing at once to do all within its power. It proposes to raise an international loan. It is willing to give all the security necessary. This security consists in revenues not already pledged for other loans and other assets—it offers that to the League and asks the League to be responsible for the loan.

The financial section of the League has examined the question and it finds it sound business. It thinks there is sufficient security for the loan—fifty million pounds sterling—and it will help Greece to raise the money, on the condition that the money shall go exclusively to the settlement of the refugees in productive work. That means that nothing must go to charity work, nothing for feeding or relief work, but it must only be used for productive work. It is controlled by a commission of four people. The chairman is Mr. Morgenthau from the United States, two members elected by the Greek government and one from the League. It means that this money is entirely controlled by this commission,

and not a penny shall be paid for anything but that one purpose. So far I think it is all right.

One of the conditions was that Greek bankers should underwrite one million pounds, which was done at once. Then the Bank of England said that it was willing at once to contribute one million pounds sterling, and was also willing to go further on the condition that the Greek government have an election in the near future. So far it is all right. I hope that the loan will be raised, especially in England, and I hope in this country you will raise your proportionate amount in the same way that the Austrian loan was raised, but, as I say, this money must only be used for productive work for the refugees, not for feeding them, not for relief work or charity, but, on the other hand, it is absolutely necessary to keep the people alive until the results of their efforts shall make them self-supporting. If you give them animals, land and feed, they have to plow their land, plant their seed, wait for it to grow and reap the harvest before they can support themselves, their wives and children, and that means they must be kept alive and fed in the meantime, and to feed one million people means large expense.

The Greek government has promised to do all in its power to feed them. It says it can provide at least ten million drachmas to feed them. That is about two hundred thousand dollars, but that is not sufficient to feed more than one-third of them, and you will understand that after losing fifty million lira which should have been used for feeding the refugees, its ability to feed them has not become greater. The rest must be, we hope will be, carried out by charity organisations, and among the charity organisations of Europe I may especially mention the " Children's Fund " in Great Brit-

ain, which has promised to do its share. We are doing our little share, as we are able, in Norway and Sweden, and I hope in Denmark, but we also hope the Americans will join in in this work.

The American government—that is, Mr. Hughes—sent a note to the European governments, the great powers, saying that the American Red Cross had to stop its work in Greece last June, but if a reconstructive scheme was produced America was willing to co-operate again and help to feed the refugees, and that, I have reason to believe, the Americans also are willing to do, and I hope, therefore, that this program will be carried out, and I may say in my opinion it is a great problem to solve, because to give money for a thing like this is not the same as charity work. It is not sinking your money in a bottomless pit, because although, when you stop, the people are just as far from the ultimate solution of their difficulties as they were before, yet it is just to tide Greece over until the refugees can be made self-supporting, and that means perhaps a year for some of them; but a definite time must elapse before they can support themselves and their families and become productive citizens in the Greek state.

But if that problem is not solved, then I am afraid of the future, because it will mean that Greece will sink into financial and economic chaos. It will mean disturbances in Greece and Greek territory, and disturbances in Greece will mean disturbances in the whole Balkan peninsula, because we could not expect the other nations to keep quiet; and disturbance in the Balkan peninsula means disturbance throughout Europe. We have to remember that all recent wars started in the Balkan peninsula, and it may be so again. Therefore, I consider it of vital importance to Europe, and I may

say for the whole world, because wars in Europe sometimes reach even these shores, and they may do so again; and therefore I think it is of vital importance to the whole world to remove this danger which so easily can be removed from Europe. So much for Greece.

After all, there is another danger spot which is graver and more dangerous in Europe at this moment, and that danger spot is to be found in Germany. I mean especially, of cours,e in the Ruhr. The condition in that district is at this moment actual war in all but the name. The Ruhr is the industrial center of Germany. It is there that the future of Germany, more or less, will be decided.

It is a danger. The condition in Germany now is a danger to Europe. It is imminent and fundamental, and it is of interest that that danger is of concern to every country in the world. The future of every country in the world is actually at stake, so far as I can understand, in connection with that problem at this moment. But how is it dangerous?

First, perhaps the greatest danger is that the seeds of a future war are inevitably being sown every day, and that makes the difficulty of preventing a coming war immensely greater. At this moment in Republican Germany there is a revival of the spirit of revenge and hate which is growing every day, and which is much, much worse than it was during any time of the war; and this again creates a revival and re-creation of monarchism and militarism on a large scale in all classes of Germany, and moreover, it is the cause of civil disorders in Germany, and will result in the disappearance of the German market for many years, and with it the other markets which are influenced by the German

market, and the disappearance of these markets from the world, even for a short time, will inevitably cripple the trade of the whole world.

The whole world is one in the present age—we are all in the one boat, to sink or to swim together. In order, therefore, to ward off the danger to Europe, some way must be found to solve the German reparations problem and satisfy France.

The whole Ruhr question, which is a burning one in my opinion, was and is a necessary consequence of the defective provisions of the Treaty of Versailles. It has been much discussed lately whether, according to the treaty, the occupation of the Ruhr is legal or not. I consider this a question of minor importance. If it is legal, I can only say, so much the worse for that treaty. I was never a great admirer of it.

I regret very deeply that this whole affair so entirely has overshadowed the real state of things, and has brought people to forget what France has suffered in the past. While all condemn the occupation of the Ruhr, and all Germany suffers and is cruelly treated, most people, even many of the Germans themselves, seem to have forgotten what has happened. They have forgotten their attack on Belgium at the beginning of the war. They have forgotten the devastation of great territories in France, and they have forgotten how French and Belgian factories have been purposely destroyed. We should try to be fair to both parties in the great struggle in which the greater part of Europe became involved in 1914. Every country, including France, spent its lives and treasure, and for that, of course, no compensation can be made, but the soil on which the struggle was mainly waged was France, and the devastation remains. It is truly contrary to all

natural feeling and reason that the loss caused by devastation in the area of the common conflict should fall upon and remain the loss of that particular country amongst the belligerents in whose territory it happened to be. So far as I understand, the justice and the necessity of reparations cannot, therefore, be disputed.

Let me add that I saw the devastated regions some few months after the Armistice was signed, and words cannot express my feelings when I looked on the formerly beautiful regions of France—the fields devastated and the neat villages reduced to heaps of stones and ruins. There is raging within me a feeling of the absurdity of war.

Last summer I travelled through those same regions again, and words cannot describe how I felt—the wonderful work that had been performed and was being performed by the industrious French people—my admiration of the manner in which, from first to last, she overcame dangers and difficulties which well might prove overwhelming for a less industrious race, and at the same time what an enormous expenditure this restoration work really meant. In my humble opinion, therefore, France and Belgium have the priority claim for compensation.

But still more important than the legal rights of France—still more important, I am tempted to say, than justice itself—is the future of Europe—the future of the world. With all deep sympathy for France, I am absolutely convinced that the policy of force, in the long run, cannot succeed in achieving either economic or political results. Such a policy of force is bound to end in failure, and those who have been trying it recently are already finding out that it is not likely to achieve for them the results they expected.

I feel tempted to remind you of some words by the old Chinese philosopher who thousands of years ago spoke about the life of man. He says when a man is born he is soft and flexible and fragile, but when he approaches death he becomes rigid and strong. In nature, too, trees and plants during their first growth are soft and flexible, but when near their death they are hard and dry. Thus we see that rigidity, strength and hardness are closely connected with death, while life means softness, flexibility and meekness. In the long run, therefore, a nation being cursed by brutal force or hardness—it is not in accordance with the laws of life—there will be no solution of the problem, and particularly of the problem of the Ruhr and reparations, and there will be no peace in Europe until force is abandoned and an agreement reached which is consented to by all parties concerned, and which all the parties concerned genuinely desire to carry out; but it is of vital importance that such an agreement should be reached as soon as possible, and before it is too late.

If Germany breaks up into its various parts, what hope will there then be of a settlement—of a solution of the problem being found? I think, then, the hope would be gone. Why? Just because I see no possibility of helping a Germany which has been split up into small countries. There would be no more reparations. That hope would be gone. But at the same time there would be no possibility of international cooperation with them, no international help, no international loan. An international loan could be given to the German Empire as a whole, but I doubt if it could be given to the fragments, which have no assets to offer. It means that the time for a solution would be gone, and what the effect on Europe would be no one of

us knows, but I am afraid a new Germany would arise out of the ashes, and that the new Germany would be built on one idea, and that one idea is called revenge.

But we hope to save Germany before it is too late—before this happens. For my part, I greatly regret that the problem of reparations has not been dealt with through the League of Nations, which is the only existing machinery of international co-operation, at any rate. I am satisfied that in the atmosphere and with the machinery of the League a settlement might have been arrived at years ago. I believe that Germany herself might have secured settlement of the reparations questions to be taken care of by the League, provided she took the necessary steps. I think she should have applied for membership in the League in 1921 when, with absolute certainty, she would have been admitted, and the whole subsequent history of Europe in that case would have been quite different from what it is now. But it could hardly be doubted that even the difficult question of reparations could then quickly have been solved when Germany would have been dealing on an equal footing with the other members of the League. It is not to be expected, however, that any international machinery, however good, could deal with the great European questions which interest and affect the vital interest, and indeed the whole future of at least four great powers of Europe, unless at least one of those great powers had asked the League to take action.

The fact is that none of the great powers have made any such suggestion to the League. There is, therefore, no ground for blaming the League for inaction, and whether the great governments should be blamed or not depends on each man's personal opinion. If, how-

ever, the main line of settlement can be agreed upon, I think there is still good hope for a solution, even in this moment. I think that it is of the most vital importance for the future of the whole world that the international conference proposed by Lord Curzon and Mr. Hughes should take place as soon as possible. If not, I am afraid we all, and also France, when it will be too late, will regret that it was not done.

It is hardly necessary to say that the conference will be of no importance unless America joins it. Why? It is, you think, that we in Europe believe that America must come and save us? No. That does not put it quite correctly. We, on our Scandinavian peninsula, could perhaps get along, to some extent, without this question being solved, but we think it is absolutely necessary for all nations to take part in the solution, and especially America—not to save Europe, but to save yourselves and to save the world, because the world will suffer if it is not saved.

I cannot doubt but that if the various governments met and discussed this difficult problem that it would be impossible for them to separate without having found a solution of it, and if the powers concerned can agree upon the line along which a solution ought to be worked out I think we have splendid evidence that a solution can be found. We have an illustration in what has been done for Austria. I think if Germany is willing to accept the solution in the same way as was Austria, Germany can and will be saved.

The situation of Austria a little more than a year ago certainly was much more difficult than that of Germany is, or ever was. Austria, a country with a capital city much too big, and a hinterland much too small seemed to have very small possibilities for economic

existence. In fact, nearly all economic experts at that time would tell you that the future of Austria was hardly possible because she had not the resources to continue a national life.

The fact is that many nations—amongst them your great nation—tried for three years to help them. They completely failed. Then the League of Nations tried it for one year, and the League of Nations completely succeeded.

During these three years the several nations spent between four and five hundred million dollars in the attempt. The United States also spent something. The result was that the financial and economic condition of Austria was in worse chaos when they finished than when they began. Then Austria appealed to the League of Nations for help. She took up her troubles with the Council. It was handed over to the finance section of the League and it proposed a solution. An international loan was raised, and in a year Austria was saved from chaos, so that it is again one of the solvent nations of the world. The fact is, that during the last year while these negotiations were going on the Austrian crown has been the most stable money in Europe, thanks to the work of the League. This shows what can be achieved by international co-operation when you have the machinery for it.

It can well be said that the first method, that of the action of isolated nations, entailed the cost of four to five hundred million dollars with a result which was *nil*. The second method, the League method, as you may call it, has cost *nil* and has resulted in the restoration of Austria.

I cannot help thinking that if similar international co-operation could be attained for Germany it would

be much easier to save her than it was to save Austria. You may tell me that, after all, Austria did not have the enormous debt of reparations to pay that Germany has. That is true. Even if it were reduced, still it will be an enormous debt to pay, but it will, of course, be distributed over a great many years, and I think if you even take into consideration the reparations to be paid, the resources of Germany are so immensely greater than those of Austria that it will be very much easier to find a solution, provided, of course, Germany is willing to accept the provisions. Those provisions will be a little hard for a nation to accept because it means international control of incomes and revenues. Austria had to submit to it. But I think even a great nation, when it is standing on the verge of the abyss to go down or be saved, would choose to be saved, even though it be through international co-operation.

Should it be through the League? It seems that the League machinery is there. It has worked extremely well in various cases, and there is no other machinery; but if you can create a better one, please go ahead and do it, and no one would welcome it more than we who are in the work. But the League is there and can be used at any moment. I know that many in this country will tell me that the League is dead. I have heard several times that the League is dead. It reminds me of a story I heard about a boy who had received a present of a small kitten, which was so small that it had not opened its eyes. On his way home the boy got very curious. He would like to see the eyes, and he tried by all possible means to make the kitten open its eyes. He did not succeed, and in his despair he drowned the kitten. He came back by the same way the next morning, and he saw the kitten lying dead in the water, but

to his astonishment he found the kitten had opened its eyes. He said, "While you were alive you would not open your eyes, but now you are dead you can see." I can only say that if the League is dead it is certainly the most active corpse history has ever known.

I think we ought all of us to remember that the world is an interlacing world. It is one world, and only one, and we all are members of it.

Mankind—at least the whole of civilised mankind—is one. You cannot really split it up even into nations. At least, its interests have a far greater share of identity than of difference. Science, art, intelligence, morality, certainly mark no boundaries. You cannot destroy or maim any intellectual center in the world without crippling the whole intellectual life of the world. It is by co-operation which one receives from another that the world advances and makes progress.

The whole of history teaches us that one sea is more dangerous for people than any other, and that sea is isolation. That means stagnation. You say it is not necessary to mix up in the political and financial difficulties of another world—another continent. It is true there is an economic side of the question, but at this moment more and more countries are economically united, and there are more every day. It must bring a new spirit into the international affairs of the world. It is not sufficient to try to erect barriers to war, not even to provide means for sentiment. We must do more, we must take away all causes of war. Into international life we must bring the spirit of brotherhood, friendship and co-operation, and when we feel that we are one, not only with our lips, but in our hearts and actions, we must know and really feel that we cannot ruin one part of the body of humanity with-

out the whole body of humanity suffering for it. National conduct should be guided by reason, justice and brotherhood. These motives in the end must be superior to brute force in all forms.

I repeat it, what is now needed in the world above all things is goodwill and confidence between nations. Could you bring that about, the world would progress tomorrow in quite a different way than the way it is doing today.

In the Andes, at the highest point of the frontier between Chile and the Argentine, thirty thousand feet above the sea, there stands a colossal bronze figure of Christ, the one hand stretched out in blessing—that means goodwill—the other hand holds the cross, the sign of fate—that means confidence—and beneath is written, " These mountains themselves shall fall and crumble to dust before the people of Chile and the Argentine will forget their solemn covenants sworn at the feet of Christ," and on the other side is written, " He is our peace who hath made both one."

Could not we bring forth such a spirit to rule the world and so insure a better world?

We need to remember the last words of a dying Roman emperor: " Thou hast conquered, oh Galilæan." There is still hope for a fallen world, " for the things that are seen are temporal, but the things that are not seen are eternal."

XIV

THE HUMANITARIAN LEAGUE OF NATIONS

RAYMOND B. FOSDICK,

Formerly Under-Secretary, League of Nations.

IN spite of all our efforts to ignore it and forget it, the issue of the League of Nations keeps cropping up. It will not stay down. The difficulty is that the world at the present time is desperately in need of a new technique as far as international business is concerned, a new method of approach to the problems which are fast overflowing the boundaries of nations. Modern science has completely revolutionised the world, and it is idle to think that we can live as our grandfathers lived a century ago. To talk in terms of Eighteenth Century formulas, to try to follow the advice of Eighteenth Century statesmen, is to blind our eyes to what has happened in a hundred years.

The League of Nations seems to be the only machinery adapted to meet the new problems by which we can handle the difficulties arising from the fact that modern science has brought the world into a close relationship.

The League's Health Work

The Health Section of the League is a case in point: Here has been organised a common campaign on disease, backed by the financial resources and moral support of fifty-four nations. In order to inform all

national health authorities rapidly and effectively of the development and spread of epidemic disease, a centralised epidemiological service has been set up; information is sent out at least twice every three weeks, and a regular monthly bulletin is issued containing statistics and charts on the incidence all over the world of Asiatic cholera, typhus, relapsing fever, dysentery, smallpox, anthrax, scurvy and other diseases. In other words, a competent agency is constantly on the watch-tower, with dependable working relations with all countries, giving definite and reliable information concerning these great plagues when they first show themselves, and before they get out of hand. Obviously this is a task which no national government by itself can undertake.

Another campaign organised by the League has to do with the international traffic in opium and its derivatives. A committee of the League has been at work on this matter now for more than three years, and, thanks to the assistance which the United States has given, a great deal has been accomplished in controlling this nefarious traffic. A system for the exchange of information between nations has been put into effect and for the first time international statistics are being collected as regards the trade, production and manufacture of opium. With this information it has been possible to check up the activities of smugglers between various countries, with the result that several of the large scale agents of the illicit trade have been suppressed.

All this has been possible because the individual efforts of nations have been harnessed together in a great co-operative campaign.

The illicit traffic in women and girls is another in-

ternational problem which demands international co-operation. A permanent committee appointed by the League has been at work on the matter for three years, and plans are now afoot for a world-wide survey on scientific lines to determine the scope of this problem and suggest methods of solution. It is interesting to note how much more the League has been able to accomplish in a short time in this way than was achieved over a long period before any centralised international machinery had been set up.

The League also has a committee to grapple with the trade in obscene publications. Here is another matter which cannot be handled by one nation alone, but in which some measure of international teamwork is absolutely essential. With this new technique a great deal has already been accomplished, and steps are now being taken which will largely eliminate this particular traffic.

The work of the League's Committee on Intellectual Co-operation furnished another example of international teamwork which is bringing large returns. This committee includes such leaders of thought as Professor Andrews Millikan, of California; Gilbert Murray, of Oxford; Mme. Curie, of the University of Paris; Henri Bergson, of the Collège de France, and others. All sorts of problems, such as international relations between universities, the means of facilitating the exchange of professors and students, the international organisation of bibliographies and assistance to the universities of Central Europe are among the matters upon which it is centering its attention.

These conferences and committees on all sorts of subjects that relate to common interests and problems are introducing a new method of approach to interna-

tional difficulties. They are establishing the habit of common action. Through them fifty-four nations are learning teamwork; they are getting the "feel" of co-operation.

If, therefore, in uncontroversial matters like disease and opium, the nations of the world can learn the value of common counsel, surely when the great test comes, and another 1914 throws down its ugly challenge to mankind, there will be a better chance for sanity and self-control and a larger hope of escape from a world wreck of untold proportions.

XV

AMERICA'S RELIEF MEASURES

JAMES CANNON, JR., D.D.

Bishop, Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

THE outstanding, and I am sometimes tempted to say the only, thing which has saved the American people from total misunderstanding, even enmity, jealousy and hatred of some of the nations of Europe has been the unparalleled, unprecedented service of mercy and help which the American people have rendered to every suffering and needy nation of the world within the past few years.

It has been my fortune to have visited Europe many times in the past twenty-five years; on one of my earliest visits one of my children was much disgusted to read in one of the leading London papers that "the Yankees were landing in droves for their annual scamper through Europe." The American people were generally pictured as raw, loud-voiced, newly rich, materialistic, lacking in culture and high ideals. When the great War broke out, official Germany thought the United States to be a nation of money grabbers, too much absorbed in money getting and too cowardly to run the risk of losing their money or their lives by entering into the War. But when at last conditions, which I need not here recount, swept our country into the War, and a steady stream of the strong, brave, best young life of our American homes poured into the

fields of France, the whole world conceived a new idea of American honour, courage and ideals.

I was in England, Scotland, France and Italy in the Spring of 1918 when the night air raid, the "Big Bertha" and "the great drive" were all inaugurated simultaneously to break down the morale of the allied armies. I met high officials, soldiers and the common people of Great Britain and France and Italy and I heard a new and genuine note of appreciation and admiration of the courage and of the self-sacrifice of our soldiers. Not once did I hear it said that we entered the War "to save our skins because we were afraid to stay out." This attack upon our motives was reserved to be made by a high American official after the War. But everywhere then men and women said we had come across the seas that right, common justice and freedom might prevail in the government of the world. Certainly, in those days, the world believed in our unselfish sincerity.

I was in Europe in the winter and spring of 1919. I happened to follow closely in the track of President Wilson in Paris, Rome and London, and saw his picture in every window and on all the billboards and heard the thrilling stories of the great throngs and wonderful enthusiasm with which he was greeted as the leader of the American people. And as a plain American citizen everywhere I went I was also heartily welcomed for my country's sake.

Later on, I was in Paris when the clouds gathered and the storm broke when President Wilson called for the George Washington and Orlando left the conference and returned to Rome and back again and I heard the clashing voices of the delegates from all over the world seeking to secure the best for themselves in the

making of the treaty. But even then our former enemies believed in the high idealism and lofty motives of the American people.

I was in Europe again the next year when the United States Senate had refused to ratify the treaty of Versailles, or to ratify the treaty guaranteeing to come to the aid of France in the event of an attack by Germany, and I found that there had developed an air of amazed questioning and that there was an atmosphere of receding warmth. Then followed the election of 1920 with its peculiar majority against the party in power and apparently against everything connected with war restrictions, war burdens and war suffering and the inauguration of what the world calls the policy of selfish isolation on the part of the American government. Since that time the American in Europe must be prepared to hear uncomplimentary words about his country. The European press simply repeat the thought and the words of the people themselves. We have been accused of staying out of the war in the beginning in order that we might become rich by selling our goods to the warring nations; and then having fattened enormously upon the woes of the rest of the world we have been accused of entering the World War to save what we had made; and now that we control the gold supply of the world and the money markets generally, we are said to have withdrawn into our shells and refused to bear any of the responsibility of helping to readjust and to rehabilitate the affairs of a shattered and bleeding world .

In September, 1922, on my return from Constantinople, I stopped over in Geneva when the third Assembly of the League of Nations was drawing to a close, and while the world was still shocked with the

horrors of Smyrna. I took dinner with Professor Gilbert Murray and some other friends, and he walked with me to the train. In parting he said, "I have been a somewhat careful student of history and I know something of the relations which different nations have borne to the life and the leadership of the world. It is my deliberate, carefully considered opinion that never in the history of this world has any nation been given such an opportunity to lead the rest of the world into the realisation of higher ideals and standards of international relations and life as has been given to America in the past three years, and it is a sad and incomprehensible thought to many of her friends and admirers that she has refused to accept this form of leadership and has left the rest of the world to face its troubles and to solve its problems without her aid. It is an awful responsibility which she must inevitably face at the bar of history."

This opinion, expressed by one of the greatest scholars and one of the leaders of thought of Great Britain and a genuine friend and admirer of our country, whether correct or incorrect, conveys some idea of what the rest of the world is thinking of the political and economic attitude of our country to other nations. But while the rest of the world is distressed at what it considers to be the unchristian, pagan, political policy of a great nation to "Let Europe stew in her own juice," there has been one outstanding, unparalleled, ever-increasing manifestation of genuine Christian Good Samaritan mercy and ministry which has saved us as a people from the stigma of cowardly and materialistic selfishness with which history might brand us. There has never been any hatred of any people, as such, by our people as a nation. We may have despised the conduct

of some rulers, of some generals, of some soldiers, but the great heart of the American nation has always responded to the cries of the suffering victims of either famine, pestilence, earthquake or sword, whether the victims have been among allied or enemy nations. It is true that there has probably never been a richer, more prosperous nation than the United States has been in recent years, but it is equally true that nowhere in history has there been anything approaching the record which has been made by our country in its efforts to relieve hunger, diseases and suffering.

I have recently seen records of hundreds of pages of the work of the great relief organisations of the nation during the past few years. There is not time to give even the total figures of the various forms of service, and any considerable detail is impossible. Beginning in Belgium before our own country entered the War, American relief of various kinds has touched in some form or another Belgium, France, Italy, Austria, Germany, Czecho-Slovakia, Poland, Hungary, Jugo-Slavia, Greece, Turkey, Palestine, Lithuania, Latvia, Esthonia, Russia and Armenia, and lately famine-stricken China and earthquake-rent Japan.

I have seen the best young men of the Slavic race gathered by the thousand at the University of Prague determined to get an education but doomed to failure had it not been for the food furnished by our American people. I have walked into a great room crowded with hungry student young men, eating the one good meal of the day, who, as soon as the word was passed around that a friend from America was in the room, arose and expressed their gratitude with thundering applause. I have stood on the steps of a great relief kitchen in Warsaw and have seen thousands of children come

swarming through every street and alley to that kitchen, wildly cheering the American flag. I have seen hundreds of men, women and children coming into Relief Stations with bare and bleeding feet, with garments ragged, dirty and sometimes infested with vermin, and I have seen them come out cleansed, clothed, shod, with grateful smiling faces. I have moved quietly through the wards of hospitals filled with the emaciated, wounded, diseased, dying derelicts of the war, cared for tenderly by American nurses. I have stood on a ship crowded with hundreds of children fleeing from their country, to escape the blood-thirsty Turk, under the care of a few American young men and women, and I have seen thousands of these children sleeping on the floor on the little blanket cots provided by their American friends, happy that they were beyond the reach of the ancient enemies of their race.

These are terribly familiar scenes to those who have been connected with the great American Relief movements of recent years.

Not including four hundred million dollars contributed by our people to the work of the Red Cross during the war, or its great relief work elsewhere, that organisation expended for the American people from July 1, 1922, to June 30, 1923, approximately five million dollars for refugee work in Greece and hospital and medical work among the Russians in Russia and Constantinople, and it has recently received over ten million dollars for work in Japan.

The American Relief Administration, which is practically a continuation of the work of the Commission for Relief in Belgium, has been the instrument for doing for the American people a truly memorable service in many of the countries of Europe. The Commission

for the Relief of Belgium administered more than one billion four hundred million dollars in importing and purchasing domestic crops on which the Commission earned, during the five years of work, over one hundred million of dollars after paying all overhead expenses. All of this hundred million was used in caring for the destitute, and at the close of the war there was a balance of two hundred and forty million francs, which was applied to rehabilitate the Universities and technical schools of Belgium and to establish educational foundations to encourage progress in learning and science.

In May, 1919, the Relief Administration opened its first feeding station in Austria and continued its work for three years. At the start, it fed sixty thousand children, and it reached the highest number, three hundred eighty thousand, in June, 1921, with a total of eight hundred and sixty-two feeding stations. The total value of food furnished was about thirteen million dollars, and of clothes one million. The Relief Administration also carried on relief work in Czecho-Slovakia, assisting in feeding and clothing over two hundred thousand undernourished and poorly-clad children and contributing foodstuffs to the intellectual and student classes over a period of two years. The Relief Administration began work in Poland in January, 1919, and continued the work until June, 1922. It furnished seven hundred and thirty million meals, which, with clothing furnished, cost over twenty million dollars, and it fed at the highest point one million three hundred and fifteen thousand children.

The Relief Administration has done perhaps its greatest and most intensive work in Russia, where it has administered approximately sixty-six million dol-

lars' worth of foodstuffs and eight million dollars' worth of medical supplies, caring for over three million persons daily. Relief has also been given in less degree in Latvia, Esthonia, Danzig, Constantinople, Jugo-Slavia and Palestine.

The Y. M. C. A., Y. W. C. A., Salvation Army, the Jewish Welfare League, the Knights of Columbus have all done relief work to a greater or less extent, and some of the church organisations in the United States, the Baptist, Lutheran, Methodist, Quaker, which are directly connected with church organisations in European countries, have sent large sums, which have been directly administered by their own representatives. The Quakers, in addition to the funds contributed by their own Societies, have been charged with the administration of large sums aggregating over two and one-half million dollars, especially in Germany and Russia, and a special fund is being raised now to feed German children during the coming winter, to be administered by the Quakers. Finally, I mention the Near East Relief, which has been, for several years, especially caring for Armenian and lately for Greek orphans. The Near East has expended, in caring for orphans and refugees, a total of eighty million dollars, and is still caring for one hundred thousand orphans in whole or in part, and has been obliged to use a large part of its funds for the past year to assist in feeding men and women refugees from Anatolia, or to permit them to die of starvation in sight of food.

This is a very hasty and very inadequate statement of some of the relief work that has been extended by our people to needy and suffering people of the world, and the record is indeed unparalleled in the history of philanthropy.

I do not believe that it is an accident that the country which has had this extraordinary record is a country where the Christian religion of the free evangelical type has been and is today a most tremendous factor in the thought and the conduct of the great masses of the people. While there have been some noble examples of Jewish philanthropy, the standard set by Jesus Christ in His teachings is the basis of appeal in all of our benevolent movements. While our nation is called a Christian nation, and while the Constitution and laws of our country are expected to conform to the standard of justice and right as set forth in the Christian religion, and while no law could stand which is clearly contrary to those standards, yet the political and the actual governmental administrative life may and does fall short sometimes. And so while our government in the view of many has not always followed the injunction "Bear ye one another's burdens and so fulfill the law of Christ," and has not always remembered that a man will be judged according to what he hath and not according to what he hath not, in its attitude toward the international life of the world, yet regardless of political policies the standard set by their Master must always determine the acts of His followers in their relation with men of every race and nation. Not only in the parable of the Good Samaritan, not only in His own daily life and ministry, but in His picture of the great and final judgment, Jesus set forth with solemn, unmistakable emphasis how intensely practical, vital and all-inclusive is His definition of Love to One's Neighbour. "I was hungry; I was thirsty; I was naked; I was sick; I was a stranger; I was in prison and ye ministered to me." "To me?" "Yes, verily, for

inasmuch as ye did it to one of the least of these, my brethren, ye did it unto me."

"The least of these": I have just seen some of them and their faces are as present before me at this moment as are your faces. Not one, not five, not a score, not a hundred—but whole companies, regiments, brigades, platoons—an army in number—of unknown, helpless, ragged, sick, hungry human beings, all children! Not only an army of children, but an army of orphan children! And not simply an army of orphan children, but of such orphan children as were never seen before, driven out of their homes and out of their country, unable to return to their native towns, villages or countryside, because the native land of these orphans is in the power of the men who killed their fathers, frequently outraged and then killed their mothers and carried their older sisters to the slavery of the Turkish harems, and their older brothers to slavery or death; orphans in a strange land, without a home, with absolutely nothing they can call their own. These are some of the "least of these" of whom the Lord was speaking as He pictured the final judgment: Did you feed the hungry; clothe the naked; care for the sick; not only your blood kin, your friends, your acquaintance, your fellow countrymen? Did you minister to the stranger? The Son of Man came to minister and to give His Life a ransom for many, because He loved us. Whatever others may do, the disciples of Jesus must have the spirit of their Master or they are none of His, and if they have that spirit they will go about doing good "to the least of these, my brethren." But how can we do these things for people, for orphans, thousands of miles away, whom we have never seen, to whom we cannot go? There is nothing too difficult for love. Love

never faileth. Love will always find a way. And love has found the way to minister to these one hundred thousand helpless, starving, naked Armenian and Greek orphans. Choice men and women, mostly young men and women, have given themselves to perform this Christlike service. These bearers of our love and givers of life have left their families, the comforts of home and have journeyed to distant lands, have lived among cruel and hostile people, have borne fatigue and privation, have faced pestilence and sometimes death, have sought, washed, disinfected, clothed, housed, nursed and fed these needy ones and given them, in your name, a chance to live. And this ministry to the widows and orphans in their affliction, which I have witnessed so recently in the Near East, has been given by the American people for these past few years in every land where there has been suffering and need.

Does such service promote international friendship? Very recently I went from the refugee camps and orphanages and hospitals of Greece to an exceedingly interesting interview with King George of Greece and later with Chrysostom, the Metropolitan Bishop of Athens, and both of them later on sent me letters from which I quote briefly. King George said, "I cannot adequately voice the great admiration which I feel for the devoted, self-sacrificing work which the Near East Relief is doing to relieve want and suffering, and especially for the wise and constructive program of that organisation for the maintenance and training of the thousands of orphans whom they have actually rescued from the very jaws of death. May I extend through you to the *Christian churches of America* the sincerest thanks of my people for their sympathy and help?"

Chrysostom, the Metropolitan Bishop of Athens,

wrote, " I take advantage of this opportunity to express the gratitude of the Greek Church to the American people for their support and the admirable work done by the American Near East Relief in Greece. This support proves that the American people are Christian with the true spirit of Christian people. Asking you kindly to convey to the American churches the best wishes and thanks of the Greek Church, I remain, Sincerely yours, Chrysostom."

Such letters as these show that the aid which we have extended to needy and suffering people has convinced them of the genuine and Christian character of our friendship. They may not, possibly cannot, understand our refusal to join the League of Nations or to co-operate in any political way with the government of their own or of other countries, but they know that we have given millions of dollars and sent choice young men and women to help them to save their people from cold, disease, starving and death, and most of them believe we have done this, because we are Christians and, like our Master, we are going about doing good.

And so while it is honestly believed by many that we have failed to meet our responsibility and our opportunity to lead the nations of the earth in the paths of peace, yet because of these Christian ministries of mercy and help we are today the best loved people on earth by the needy and suffering, and it is by our continued acts of Christian love we must try to preserve the spirit of love and goodwill until the time will come when our government will recognise its responsibility for genuine leadership and take its place at the Council Table of the Nations and throw all the weight of its tremendous power and resources in favour of justice, right and peace throughout the world.

Let us, therefore, as representatives of the Christian churches, continue to emphasise the tremendous value of this Christlike expression of friendship for the needy and suffering people of the world. The outstanding appeals today are—First: For a sufficient fund to feed the children of Germany through the coming winter. This appeal must not, it cannot, be permitted to fail. Germany must be made to realise that American sympathy and genuine help includes the children of our wartime enemy, just as truly as it includes the outstanding appeal to save and to nourish the Armenian orphans who have been brought to their sad plight by Turkey, the ally of the German government. Wherever in all the earth are found famine, pestilence, suffering and death, there is the great opportunity for the American churches to promote international friendship, and in the performance of this duty every Christian must do his part. While we long for more active governmental leadership in helping the world to final peace, and while we must, as citizens, endeavour to secure that result, as churches we must continue to convince the world of our neighbourly goodwill and love.

XVI

ENGLAND'S CHURCH MOVEMENTS FOR PEACE

THOMAS NIGHTINGALE,

General Secretary, National Free Church Council of England and Wales.

MY Christianity tells me three things: First, the spiritual nature of man. Speculative atheism is gone, but practical atheism has taken its place. I would rather have a man who disbelieved in a God and lived as though there was one, than a man who believed in a God and lived as though there wasn't. The intellectual atheism of the last century has disappeared, and all men everywhere recognise that man is more than dust and possesses the powers of a world to come. My Christianity also tells me that God is working and working all the time, and in the third place it speaks to me of the social implications of the gospel.

Before the Church can do its full work it must emancipate itself from formality and conventionality. It must let itself go and lose itself in a passion for humanity. It must also give over defending itself. God's last word is not "church" but "kingdom," and the chief instrument for the setting up of that kingdom is the Church which our Lord founded. The Church hesitant must become the Church militant. Like our

soldiers, it must go "over the top." It must not only "hold the fort," but storm forts.

Dr. Ramsay, in his fascinating book entitled, "My Travels in Turkey," tells that upon one occasion he engaged a guide who was a Turk. This man turned up the next morning, dressed in real Turkish fashion with voluminous scarlet trousers and white jacket, and Dr. Ramsay says that he was the most model guide he ever had and lived up to the splendour of his clothes. The Church must live up to its creed, its prestige and its power.

We need to preach the gospel of a new emancipation. The history of the world is one of a series of deliverances—intellectual, social, moral and spiritual. The philosophy of Bacon brought intellectual deliverance to Europe. Martin Luther, religious emancipation, John Wesley tried to deliver the Church of his day from formality, Lincoln freed the slaves. In my own country feudalism was broken, the franchise came and with it the emancipation of women.

In my own little village, when I was a boy, the village mill was burned down, and many lives were lost. I can see one of the firemen now, with hot debris up to his waist, crying for deliverance. There were two ways of getting him out. The first was to apply dynamite, but the dynamite that would have blown the stones up would have blown him up, and the second state would have been worse than the first. The other method was to turn on the hose pipe, cool the stones and get him out alive. This was done. Our business is to release everything that holds man down and get him out alive, making the bounds of his freedom wider yet.

Of course man stands central to the universe. He is more important than systems, markets and the rise and

fall of political parties. The man who discovers a planet is bigger than the planet he discovers, and we have to deal with him in his moods, guilt, tendencies and destiny, and nothing is right until he is put right. If society is built up, not on the soldier, but on the citizen, then we must make that citizen clean in body and mind and pure in soul, giving to him those conditions that will help him to unfold his better nature.

It is no use of storming at one's age. Anybody can denounce cancer; but why cancer? Our business is to inspire and guide and fill the age in which we live with Godliness. This is our chance, and this is our work. There are times when we become impatient, but we must remember that all good things come slowly; not because God is unwilling, but because man is so stupid and so foolish.

Take in my own country, the post office tried to kill the telephone. Sir Walter Scott declared that the inventor of gas was a madman. Twenty-six barons signed Magna Charter, and only three could do so in their own name. Parliament at one time put to death thousands of witches, and in doing so thought it was rendering good service. In the eighteenth century Parliament was thoroughly corrupt and dishonest. In that century everybody swore, so I am told, including ministers of religion. Every fourth house in London was a drink shop and over the doors of some of them one could read the words: "You can get drunk for two pence—dead drunk for four pence, straw provided." As recently as one hundred years ago mothers in my country carried their babies in their arms as early as four o'clock in the morning to the mills and factories of Lancashire and Yorkshire. In those days children worked in mines and factories fifteen hours a day.

Parliament reduced the fifteen hours to twelve hours, not because they wanted to, but because the graveyards were getting full of children. John Bright declared that a ten-hour bill would be ruinous to British industry, and Shaftesbury fought him and won. All this belongs to the dim past, and things are not quite so bad now.

The work of the Christian Church is to change the climate. There is a difference between weather and climate. The Evangelical Revival was due to a change in the religious climate. I am told that they have, sometimes, beautiful weather in Greenland and vile weather in Italy, but they cannot grow grapes in Greenland while they can in Italy, even in the worst of summers. The pioneers have always changed the climate. In my own country they revised the penal code; they abolished the corn laws, they inaugurated education; they started the temperance movement, and brought about other reforms. We still need another change in the moral climate, out of which great social evils will drop like bits of dead lead.

What is our business? It is to create a fellowship of all those who believe in Jesus, to give the Christian conscience a voice in reference to great social evils and national situations. Take, for example, the question of capital and labour. The business of the Church is not so much to formulate economic creeds as it is to impart a new spirit and a new temper to the world as she finds it. Two ideals are associated with industry—profit for the employer and wages for the employee. What is the result? Group interests and selfishness, but the one purpose of industry is the well being of the community. The Church has to face that logical issue. Goodwill in place of selfishness is what we want. The

worker in the main does not seek riches. Well, if he does he will not get them, but what he does seek and what he has a right to expect is material security.

On the question of wealth I want to point out the undue desire to get it, the unchristian method so many people use to acquire it and the unchristian use to which so many people put it. It is the business of the Christian Church to show the way out of the present situation, to uproot selfishness, and in its place plant love and goodwill. The creation of a civic conscience, a social conscience and a national conscience through the individual is the only remedy for all our ills.

We need to capture every situation for Christ. Psychologists tell us that reason, will, conscience, emotion and judgment are not separate entities of personality, that personality is one and these are related and interrelated, fused and interfused. We separate them thus merely for purposes of explanation. What is true of personality is true of our common social and national life. There are people who say that business is business, politics is politics, sport is sport, pleasure is pleasure, and religion is religion. It is all wrong to talk like that. There is only one compartment, and God must fill it from top to bottom and from side to side.

Let me illustrate what I mean—in my own country some years ago a man went to an auction sale and bought a very pretty door. He had it placed into his house. Then he grew dissatisfied with the house. He felt he must either take the door out or bring the house up to the quality of the door. The door challenged and condemned the rest of the house. He decided not to take the door out, and so had the house painted and decorated and brought up to the standard of the door. Our Lord said: "I am the door," let Him be placed

into the house of life and the whole of it will have to come up to that standard—business, politics, social relationship and everything. That is our task.

The Apostle Paul declared that ours is the ministry of reconciliation. The word "reconciliation" in that connection means readjustment. We are to adjust man to God and to his brother man and to the whole round of his relationship, but some one will say: "If that is true, physician, heal thyself." All I want to say in that connection is this, that the Church is not divided, it is merely dislocated. Fundamentally and spiritually the whole Church is one. The Roman Catholic, the Anglican and the Free churches all worship the same Father and believe in the same Saviour. Ecclesiastically the Church is dislocated. If my shoulder is dislocated it is still a member of the body, and the body is still one, but not until it is readjusted can the body enjoy fullness of life, complete rest and render perfect service. So it is with the Church. Not until its parts are readjusted can it hope to claim the full endowment of the gifts of the Spirit.

Now what are we doing in my own country in reference to "life and work"? First of all there is a movement among all the Methodist churches. It is a distinctly spiritual movement. Those three denominations are now praying together, thinking together, toiling together. In addition to this each has set up its Social Service Committee, and they are thinking out how the principles of Christianity may be applied to all social aspects in English life.

In the second place there has been established a Council of Christian Churches, which includes the Roman Catholic, the Anglican, the Free Churches and the Salvation Army. They are now agreed on what

are called the "Four Points of the Temperance Program." First: That no intoxicating drinks shall be sold to youths under eighteen years of age. Second: Local option for England and Wales. Third: Sunday closing for England and Wales. Fourth: That social clubs with drink license shall be placed under the same supervision as the ordinary drinking saloon. The first of these has already been won by Lady Astor and her friends in the House of Commons.

Third: There are summer schools which meet at Oxford and other places to study the application of Christian truth to the whole round of human life. Truth has two values. It has a value in itself and a value in relationship. For example, a chair has a value in itself. It is worth so much in the open market, but its second value comes when it supports some one. A dollar has a value all its own, but its second value is established when it is able to purchase something that will meet human needs. "If our virtue go not forth from us 'tis all the same as if we had it not." We read in reference to the coming of our Lord that the word became flesh and dwelt among us and we beheld His glory.

Fourth: There has been established in England what is known as "C. O. P. E. C.," that is a Christian Council of Politics, Economics and Citizenship. Groups of people have been meeting and studying all sides of the social problem, and they will assemble in Birmingham in April of this year to pool their findings and to issue statements for the guidance of the people. I think it is true to say that very often spiritual issues are rooted in social conditions. I have great sympathy with a poor woman living in one of the slums of London, who said to a social reformer when he was asking her to

give up the drink: "What's the good of belonging to an Empire on which the sun never sets if you live in an alley on which it never rises."

Bishops to the number of two hundred and fifty met at Lambeth, London, some two years ago and issued what is known as the "Lambeth Appeal." That Appeal manifested quite a new spirit and a new temper, not only towards Christians of other communions, but also toward the social problem, but some of us are disappointed that they have not, as far as England is concerned, begun to act on Paragraph 13 of their own findings, which suggests the establishment of a Council of Christian Churches in order to bring to bear on social and national evils, the full weight of their intelligence, will and moral force. Some of us would like to see the establishment of a great Christian Parliament of Churches and kindred organisations setting up commissions dealing with education, housing, morality, temperance, capital and labour, international peace and watching carefully political situations as they may arise from time to time. It seems as though we cannot yet get it, the churches being so busy with ecclesiastical readjustments. I want us to get on with the real business of the kingdom for which the Church of Jesus Christ exists.

It will take us a long time before we can get our point of focus in the accepting of one form of ecclesiastical government, even if that were desirable; but in the meantime, what! Why not unite where we can and for great social ends? What things we could do, if only we were one in Christian fellowship without sacramental implications and in our desire to effect the social implications of the gospel. Vain dream! Well, let us dream it!

I am waiting for some great soul to arise or some great event to take place that will weld together for us a great universal Church, including the Roman Catholic, with its gift for organisation, the Anglican with his love of culture and reverence, the Presbyterian with his dignity and strength, the Congregationalist with his love of order, the Methodist with his fire, the Baptist with his zeal, the Quaker with his love of peace and the Salvation Army with his passion for souls. Then should we march as we sing: "Like a mighty army moves the Church of God."

XVII

CO-OPERATIVE ACTION AND WORLD PEACE

FRED B. SMITH,

Chairman, Commission on Councils of Churches, Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America.

TOGETHER with others assembled here today, I am filled with a deep sense of gratitude for this hour. We are met upon a sacred spot of earth, where our ancestors thought great thoughts, dreamed great dreams, dared great tasks and saw great visions. No company has a right to meet here for an ignoble purpose. No speaker ought to desecrate this spot by the use of idle words. The place calls for the highest aspirations of which we are capable in considering the common welfare of humanity. I venture to say that while accepting those limitations of which we are fully conscious, the theme which brings us here is worthy of the best thought on earth and therefore appropriate for these historic surroundings. Not only are we grateful for the memories of Independence Hall, but also for the auspices under which we are convened. "The World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches." Each word is fraught with significant meaning. Amid the turmoil and confusion of a distraught world, saturated with war traditions, wrecked by war experiences, terrorised by the fear of more war, we may well thank God that this Society has

been raised up at this point in the history of mankind. While cherishing genuine sympathy for any and every sincere effort working for the cause of peace and good will in the world I am strongly of the belief that from the viewpoint of the Christian Church and the Christian Religion this movement represents our best hope of ultimate success. This convention, this gathering and these delegates are to witness to a lively interest in helping to answer the deepest cry which has ever found expression by the human race, viz.: Can the future generations, and indeed the present one, be safeguarded from the unspeakable ravages of more war? Does the future promise peace and brotherhood or revolution and collective slaughter? Everything else is incidental to this supreme issue. Nothing else matters much. Find a suitable answer and good hope can be entertained for every vexed problem. But to fail in this means the surrender of all we hold dear.

We must all be encouraged in the presence of the fact that the greatest humanitarians of nearly every creed and race are giving these questions the preeminence in their thought and time. Boards, committees, schools and universities are springing into being if haply the method may be found which will prove to be the right one. I do not profess wisdom enough to even appraise the value of many of the proposals being brought forward. But I am absolutely certain of one factor which is indispensable no matter what form or detail may be developed. The world cannot be made safe against more outbreak of force and violence until America has been led into full, complete co-operation with the other nations which are seeking this high purpose. A thousand arguments or reasons are presenting themselves to substantiate this

statement. Time would fail in any attempt to enumerate them even partially, but a few are so commanding that we may well emphasise them.

In the first place the expectations of the other nations seem centered in what this America of ours will do. In a tour last year around the world which led into nineteen nations, speaking upon this theme, I was amazed to be confronted with this fact everywhere. One could wish it were not true, or at least not to such a high degree. "What is your country going to do about it?" was the question brought to me over and over again. No great imagination is necessary to understand how embarrassing this became with the newspapers being constantly filled with "America First" headlines. I believe that were a cable or radio message to go out from Washington tonight stating that the philosophy of "isolation" was to be abandoned and one of full, complete co-operation to be adopted by America, bon-fires would be lighted around the world, celebrations would be held and men and women would stand to their feet in a new hope of peace and enduring brotherhood. We of this fair, favoured nation, so blessed of God, so sheltered from the terrible effects of the Great War in which our young men participated so nobly, need to be intelligently alarmed about the possibilities, and even more the probability, of a return of war.

For myself, I wish I had become thoroughly alarmed about this question in 1911. I am not conceited enough to believe that I could have changed the events of history very much, and certainly I am not indulging even the faintest idea that the great war could have been prevented. But a full realisation of the danger then would have made a vast difference in my own personal

feelings in recent years. This is the thought which prompts this comment. In the year referred to I was in London to extend an invitation to the great William T. Stead to come to New York, and deliver an address in Carnegie Hall, in April of 1912, upon the general topic of "Principles of World Peace." Mr. Stead at first declined the invitation, abruptly saying "It is utter folly for me to go to New York to deliver an address upon the principles of world peace while we on this side of the ocean are getting ready for the worst war the world has ever known." I remember distinctly that I disagreed with Mr. Stead upon that probability, told him I did not believe such a war was going to occur and frankly did not think he seriously cherished such an expectation. The invitation was pressed to such an extent, that he was finally led to accept. Later he was en route to New York as my guest, when he went down, off the banks of Newfoundland, with the ill-fated Titanic. I then telegraphed the great James McDonald, editor of the "Toronto Globe," urging him to come to Carnegie Hall to speak in the place of Stead. He responded to the invitation, and I will not forget, as will none of the others who were in that great assembly, the address which the famous editor delivered. Again and again he used this form of argument, "If Stead were here he would say this." "If Stead were here he would say this." For more than an hour he simply delivered the message which he believed William T. Stead would have given had he lived to fulfill his appointment. When he finished he was no nearly exhausted that the chairman had to assist him from the platform. At midnight of the same night, I went to his room in the Astor Hotel, found him awake, tossing restlessly upon a sleepless pillow. Wishing to show

appreciation for his masterly effort I said, "McDonald, you go to sleep and rest, for you delivered a great oration in Carnegie Hall tonight." Whereupon he replied "Please do not call it an oration, Smith, did I convince them, did I convince them?" McDonald in that hour was not thinking of the excellence of any words he had spoken, but rather as to whether he had succeeded in sufficiently impressing us with the possible perils of a great outbreak of war. Personally I now wish I had believed that intensely in 1911 and had gone forth to speak with all my power against the war fury which was gathering. This leads me to suggest to you, that what America needs in this hour is some voice or voices speaking in a fashion which will intelligently but thoroughly alarm the nation concerning the possibilities of another great world war in the future, and along with it to convince the people of the fact that one of the surest guarantees that such a thing will not occur is to bring about the full, complete, unlimited co-operation of this nation in its relationship to the rest of the world. America on a basis of interdependence to other nations is an earnest of peace. America persisting upon isolation is an added probability of more war.

In the second place, I believe America must be carried into this full co-operation with all the nations because anything short of that is practically a denial of the very religion we profess. We are very proud to call this a Christian nation, and if you will take the map and look at the different colours used to describe the various religions you will observe that the map maker paints us in the list of those called Christians. We are further encouraged as we are told by the statistician that church membership is steadily, persistently

on the increase. But the practical fact is this, we may go on making maps and painting our part of the earth's surface in that colour, which indicates the Christian population. We may go on adding more members to our various ecclesiastical bodies. We may go forward building more churches and schools. We may even multiply our gifts to foreign missions, but the persistent theory of American "Isolation" based upon the pernicious "America First" doctrine will eventually neutralise every other claim we make to this sublime faith and will kill the true spirit of the very gospel we profess to preach. I wonder if any one of you can imagine Jesus, the founder of the Christian religion, going about in His day among the Jews in Galilee or Palestine preaching to them the theory of the "Hebrews first, beware of entangling alliances." The religion we boast of is based upon the universality of the love of God, the brotherhood of all men, and the common fatherhood of God. Christianity is not based upon special privileges for unique classes of people, even though they happen for the time to be the most favoured in the world. Therefore American Interdependence and American responsibility for complete, entire co-operation with all the other nations of the earth is demanded if we are to maintain the religion called Christianity, which we profess with our lips and acknowledge in the prayers we offer at the altar of the Christian Church.

In the third place, I am led to feel strongly the necessity of this attitude upon the part of my country toward the rest of the world, because, its reflex influence upon our own life may, in my judgment, be the salvation of the nation itself. I have heard a good many arguing with real force and plenty of substantial

evidence that America ought to share with the rest of the world fully in her co-operation because of the need of the less favoured peoples who have suffered so fearfully from the ravages of collective slaughter, but it may be when history is fully written that the students may discover that America herself needed this kind of responsibility and service even more to save her own life than to help preserve the peace of the rest of the world. Many voices are sounding the note of alarm in reference to the decline in our moral idealism. In 1910 we are told there were 50,000 divorces granted in the United States, and are now shocked to read that 150,000 were granted in 1922. Other incidents of a kindred type could be given to prove that the old nation herself is in need of some great call to a high and noble self-sacrificing purpose. As we look back now we remember, almost like a dream, those heights to which we were taken in 1917 and 18. Sacrifice seemed to be a joy, men were willing to endure anything, give up anything, for the sake of God and country and humanity. Pretty largely this impulse is lost, the vision seems to have disappeared and a generous proportion of the population are prepared now to turn the whole country into one vast playhouse of special privileges and any kind of indulgence. In the realm of legislation it is rather distressing to follow the proposals which are being made now in the various legislatures and halls of Congress. One is not impressed in following this trend with the prominence of moral qualities which seem to be involved. In most cases they are rather severe, economic measures. Fundamentally, America is not selfish, fundamentally the people can be moved most deeply under some great humanitarian appeal, and it would seem to me that leaving out for

the moment all questions of the result to be secured, America for her own sake must be led into this complete, unbroken co-operation with the other nations of the world working in behalf of peace, good will and brotherhood.

Permit me to bring this forward in a little different angle. I would like to ask all those who may disagree about details of procedure to give some tangible reason why America should not be upon this basis of world service. We have long since practically silenced all the voices which have spoken of the philosophy of isolation when the question of religion is involved. We no longer shrink or apologise or delay when in the presence of a call to send Missionaries to the remotest peoples on earth. We do not hesitate in our world views when we are brought face to face with the task of education. Here again we hurry our ambassadors all over the face of the globe. Last year, in China, I was interested to meet Miss Woolley, the noble President of Mt. Holyoke College, who was traveling in company with a commission visiting the Oriental nations for the purpose of standardising the principles of education. They seemed to think it perfectly natural that a commission of Americans should be over in that strongly different part of the world helping to raise the standards of intellectual life. Surely I need not tell you that we are far from being isolationists when dollars are involved. It has been my duty and privilege to travel around the world several times. Upon two occasions I was led to visit several of the Islands of the South Seas, but I was never able to find one place where there were no representatives of American business concerns to be found. They are literally everywhere. If there is a prospective dollar which seems

likely to show itself inside of ten years, there is always an American sitting around waiting for that dollar to appear. I am not criticising this. I believe it is perfectly normal, right, just and proper. We are responding to the world call in religion; we are responding to the world appeals in philanthropy; we move out under the impulse of educational need. We are everywhere acknowledging our economic ambitions. But we falter when we are asked to enter the political realm and share in those tasks where the representatives of governments sit around the table planning for peace, brotherhood and good will. It would seem to me that we ought to do one of two things: Either acknowledge that our politicians as a class are so feebleminded and so much below the average mentality of the representatives of other nations, that we cannot compete with them, and therefore excuse ourselves by a frank statement of this kind, or else we ought to call home all the rest of the Americans and accept the policy of isolation completely. You shudder at such thought, and so do I. It is unthinkable, it is impossible, it is brutal, it is un-Christian, and because it is so, I therefore plead that America shall accept her place in the political realm as well as all others, with no fear but that in this, as in other respects, God will raise up capable men and women who can represent the United States in any court or in any council without entangling themselves to the detriment of the nation, and with great profit to the cause of universal good will.

In responding upon this theme of America and Interdependence I would not be true to myself if I did not express the belief that very largely this whole question is one of morality based upon fundamental religious impulses. After all, what is it which has happened to

us? We seem to have lost step with those great visions which swept us in 1917-18. I think any thorough investigation will bring back but one conclusion, namely, we have sagged in our moral idealism. While this may be said most appropriately here as we convene upon this home soil, which gives us liberty to speak frankly of our own shortcomings, I think I will not give offense to those who represent other nations, when I say that that is pretty largely the world situation. We may long for peace and brotherhood until we have worn out our generation with the longing, but if we base our hope only in the legality of documents or the mechanism of leagues or the authority of judiciaries, we will not get very far. While a firm believer in organisations and advocate of courts and the champion of commissions and conferences, I am more convinced in this hour than at any time in life that essentially the greatest need is a mighty religious appeal which will lift the nations out of the sordid greed which demands the "uttermost farthing," the jealous ambitions for the last inch in boundary lines and the determination to have the political supremacy. Some sanction is necessary which can carry us to some place where true brotherhood, the love of God and the Kingdom of goodwill shall be the dominating purpose and the controlling ideal. I lose hope of abiding peace and goodwill among men unless the Gospel of Him of whom the angels sang this carol from the skies, in its purity, shall be accepted as the basic platform of men and nations.

The Rev. Brierley Kay this morning, in closing his address before the Convention, said "God grant we may fully pay the debt we owe to those heroic men who died on the battlefields from 1914 to 1918." He said

this as he plead for new energies to be released in the interest of this program of goodwill. I should like, in closing, to borrow his figure and say "God grant that we who are alive today may so live and work and think and pray that we may meet fully our obligation to the generations which are yet to be born." I am loath to believe that the generation of which I am a part, having at its disposal the terrible illustrations of the great war, is to fail in developing some plan of life that will safeguard those who are to come after us from indescribable horrors that must ever follow in the wake of war.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are here on a sacred spot, we are under majestic auspices, we are here upon a great mission. I believe that any man or woman who, in his or her day, can add one step or one item to this great program which contemplates the brotherhood of all men and enduring peace, may well lie down to die satisfied with the achievements of life.

XVIII

WORLD INTERDEPENDENCE

ALICE L. PARSONS,

New York State President, American Association of University Women.

MORE than one hundred and forty-seven years ago a little group of daring men risked their all to be independent. They had tried dependence and found it did not give them opportunity to realise their hopes for this new land. Dependence limited the independence promised them—the realisation of their dream. To that dream of usefulness, of success, of service, they pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honour. It was no empty pledge. Had they failed, their lives would have been forfeited, their fortunes confiscated, their honour infamy.

Now is the time, this is the moment, when we, their descendants, their spiritual inheritors, should follow their example and make a declaration of interdependence. Moving time has revealed to us in turn that independence is not enough; just as one hundred and forty-seven years ago our forefathers realised that dependence on a mother country could not realise our destiny, commercially, industrially, agriculturally as well as socially and spiritually, so we know that independence is not adequate for our own development, success or even stability. The keen American who appraises the trade balances, the farm prices, the manu-

facturers' reports and adds to them the restlessness, the partisan bitterness, the cynical carelessness, knows that another syllable must be added to our noble manifests, that we may attain life—liberty—the pursuit of happiness, a declaration of interdependence, to which we, in our turn, will pledge our all. In interdependence, in co-operation between nations lies our path to prosperity, to happiness, to self-realisation.

We have all been told that the Chinese are scrupulously honest in their business affairs and, moreover, that they are so not from any ethical or moral stricture, but because honesty is the best policy. Isn't it truer to believe that the Chinese have perceived that justice to all is each one's advantage and behind that is the profound truth also in the Christian commandment, "do unto others as ye would that others should do unto you." Consummate self-interest is sublime selfishness—translated into practical politics it is the struggle for real democracy.

We Americans can feel proud of our experiment in applied democracy, a great contribution to political practice—the successful functioning of a federation of states. It was not without reason that Mr. Lloyd George spoke of George Washington as the founder of the British Empire. I believe that George Washington himself—and those men who, in this hall, signed their names to that declaration, would be proud that their acts were a determining factor in the British Commonwealth of Nations which the British Empire became the other day. If only our experience could be more than the inspiration it was for that greatest confederation of states, the League of Nations, and be a participating and determining factor in it.

The United States having found a method by which

democracy could function in a federation of states, has developed one thinking mechanism of neighbourliness. It maintained the longest and most peaceful boundary in the world. The Canadian frontier, 3,000 miles long, without a fort, a battleship or a soldier, only an imaginary line over land and water, is an impressive testimony of the will to harmonise, to understand, to co-operate. We all know that the ten million people on one side of the line are not afraid of the 110 million on the other; that the 110 million are not afraid of the overseas land and sea forces behind the ten million. But absolutely and inevitably on both sides of the line are peoples and governments anxious to agree to co-operate for each other's and their own best interests. A perfect example of the smooth functioning of interdependence. Would that the frontier between Germany and France were but an imaginary line unarmed, unguarded. Then might the world breathe easier!

Even as the United States first developed this mechanism of federation, so also has she been a pathfinder in international arbitration. To be sure a distinguished jurist of our own time framed the protocol of the Permanent Court of International Justice, but it was an earlier American jurist who first conceived the idea, David Dudley Field. In 1842 he drew up his scheme for an international tribunal. Last summer, a country convention of the League of Women Voters was held at Haddam, Connecticut, on the very spot where David Dudley Field was born in 1805. From that convention a message was sent to our late President, affirming our faith in his ambition and David Dudley Field's vision, that our country should be a member of the World Court; should play its rôle in that great tribunal.

It will be only the timourous, the blind, and the old who will refuse to allow our country to take its place in the interdependence of the world. The young are ready for it, are eager for it, are trained for it.

I watched recently the football game between Harvard and Princeton, and admired the vivid sportsmanship of the players and the crowd; the realisation suddenly came to me that not only those young men and women, but all young men and women, need only to see that international co-operation is a question of sportsmanship and the cause is won. The youngsters know how to take a referee's decision without protest, how to give the other side a fair field, so each player has his chance—for only then is the playing good and the game worth while. World interdependence is only sportsmanship on an international plane. When the youth of America realise it, they will achieve it for us with the same superb courage and finality which marked their fighting and their dying at St. Mihiel and Chateau Thierry.

On the 4th of July, 1921, I was in London at a meeting of university women from all over the world—the keynote of which meeting was the intimate interdependence of women and of education the world around. It was a wonderful day for such a meeting. American flags were flying all over London—America was celebrated by high personages, by the public and the press. No note was sounded, not a word was spoken, but of goodwill—and appreciation of America's great contribution to world peace and world polity.

I hoped then, as I hope now, that that celebration—that meeting might be a portent, a prophecy for the future—that the United States, which conceived the idea, perfected the means for federated action; whose

jurists for eighty years have dreamed a world tribunal, whose beautiful youth knows and practices good sportsmanship even into the jaws of death, that these United States will accept the obligations of world interdependence by full participation in world organisation. On that prophetic day—the liberty bell may ring again from Independence Hall to announce a new revelation of America's destiny—not only independence of all autocracy, but interdependence of all democracy to which we in courage, faith and humility pledge our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honour.

PART III

CO-OPERATING ACROSS NATIONAL BORDERS

XIX

A MESSAGE FROM ENGLAND

T. G. BRIERLEY KAY,

Rector, Christ Church, Marylebone, London, England.

THE World Alliance seeks International Peace through the Christian Churches, but the Alliance does more; it removes from the Christian Churches the roots of all evil. Some people think that money is the root of all evil. I don't think so. The roots of all evil are stupidity and jealousy. The Alliance shows that it is stupid to think that we can accomplish as much separately as collectively, and it removes to a large extent that curse of all Christian work—jealousy. The World Alliance is not the only instrument which makes for international peace. There is International Industry, International Literature, and there is travel and Foreign Missions. But the supreme factor which is the sacred deposit of all countries is the Christian sentiment. The Alliance seeks to use this. If you can get a League of Christian Forces pledged to peace, then you go a long way to secure the end in view.

God is the God of peace.

The Saviour is the Prince of Peace, and God will work His purpose out either through us or over us. It seems to me that this is the hour and opportunity to allow God to work His purpose out through the Christian Churches, and I count it an enormous privilege to

convey to the Conference at Philadelphia, however feebly, something of the feeling which is strong on the other side of the ocean, especially among all who try to see far, that God is calling all peoples of the world, and that call grows louder and louder, to unite together in the comradeship of a great adventure on behalf of a broken, a shattered and a distracted world.

We in England look to our brethren in the U. S. A. to bring to this comradeship that stimulus and inspiration, that freshness of outlook and bigness of vision, that love of life, love of creative genius which we have come to associate with the U. S. A., in order to help us to fulfil that destiny for which, we believe, God has been preparing our race through centuries past.

That destiny, we are realising more and more in England, is not to rule, but to serve. There is a new spirit abroad. The old spirit, which must have been, and we know was, offensive to other nations, of aggressive and acquisitive so-called imperialism, is, I believe, gradually dying out, and its place is being taken by a much more human and a much simpler and humbler and Christian spirit of wanting to be of some service to the world at large. That, at least, is the impression which has been made upon me during the last twelve years since I came back to work in England after thirteen years in New Zealand.

I see a tremendous change coming about in the outlook and the objective of the politician, the business man and, not least, the Churchman. The future fills me with far greater hope than dismay, though the problems before us are big enough, God knows, to save us from any undue confidence in "princes or in any child of man," but through all the blood and tears of recent times I believe God is working His purpose out and is

only waiting for our whole-hearted co-operation with Him and with one another to inspire with His Spirit of love and brotherhood and mutual service all nations and peoples and kindreds and tongues, that they may realise they are members of one great family under Him, the Father God, and so live together in peace and concord. "Come over and help us." These are the words which are in my mind as I think of the tremendous potentialities for life and peace which lie deep in the heart of the United States of America.

God grant the debt we owe to the past may be paid by us in full measure to the generations yet to come.

The World Alliance is the best instrument we know to carry out God's purpose of peace and good-will. We may have and we know we have little disagreements, but in spite of all disagreements we must never cease to work for what would be the greatest of all safeguards for peace and liberty, the firm alliance and friendship between all the Christian Churches working together with God for the peace of the world.

XX

A MESSAGE FROM CANADA

ARTHUR GARRATT DORLAND,

Professor, Western University, London, Ontario.

A TRULY international gathering such as this is big with promise of what the Church co-operating across national boundaries may eventually accomplish in reconciling the nations and redeeming the world from war. The supreme task of the Church is, I take it, to establish on earth the Kingdom of God. A common authority of God is the only hope of the world. As representatives of different churches and different national groups we have different methods and different programs; but fundamentally we are all striving to attain this one supreme task. For this reason the Church in all lands must stand for an ideal which is more than a national ideal, and for a patriotism which is more than ordinary patriotism, a Christian ideal and a Christian patriotism which demands the practice of goodwill to other nations. Or, in the words of Edith Cavell: "I now see that patriotism is not enough, I must die without hatred towards anyone."

Such observations as these may be commonplace, and yet I would submit that the world today is not suffering from such an excess of national idealism that they are out of place, Lord Birkenhead to the contrary notwithstanding! For it is a shocking commentary on the prevailing pessimism and the lowering of ideals when

the Chancellor of a British University, in his official rectoral address, tells the students of Glasgow that idealism in national affairs is impossible and might easily become a deadly source of national peril. Such words as these is a direct challenge to the Church in its great mission of redeeming the world from war as the chief obstacle in achieving its supreme task of establishing on earth the Kingdom of God. I believe that each national group here, and each branch of the Church within it, has a special part to play in this great redemptive work, in this spiritual disarmament of the world.

As representing Canada, may I be allowed to say a few words as to what part we might play in this great work of promoting international goodwill. We Canadians have always taken pride in the cordial relations which have existed for over one hundred years between the people of the United States and ourselves. Our national boundaries are not "natural frontiers," nor strategic lines of defense. They exist only as an imaginary line. Our national boundaries march side by side for nearly two thousand miles without fort or barricade, as an imaginary line resting solely on the goodwill and common understanding of our two peoples. I wish that more national boundaries were only imaginary lines of a similar kind; but I am afraid that instead they too often resemble what the little boy defined as a parallel of latitude, *i. e.*, "as a menagerie lion running around the earth!"

It is only natural that we in Canada should have much in common with the people of the United States. As the fourteenth colony in the original group of American colonies, we are always mindful of our common background and family connection. We flour-

ish on this continent as two great English-speaking federations, heirs to the liberty of all the ages, living side by side in peace and amity. We have not always seen eye to eye. We have had serious differences in the past over boundaries and other matters. But, as in the Geneva Award of 1872 and the Alaskan Boundary Award of 1903, we have both been willing to submit our differences to a Court of Arbitration and to accept the decision, even though it was not entirely acceptable to our people. However, I am voicing what I believe to be the general sentiment of our people when I say that it is unthinkable to us that any differences could arise between the people of the United States and ourselves which could not be settled by arbitration. In fact, our relations with you have all gone to prove the entire practicability of a Court of International Justice, for we have, in conjunction with Great Britain, demonstrated to the world that affairs involving national honour and interest can be settled in an international Court of Justice.

In matters of trade our two peoples have not always been successful in making reciprocal arrangements, but there has been, nevertheless, a real reciprocity in the less material but more worth while things of the spirit. You have given us many distinguished preachers and educators, while we have reciprocated by sending you men whom we could ill afford to lose. In the fields of education, in which I am most familiar, Canada can claim distinguished men like Dr. Barker; the late Sir William Osler; Professor J. T. Shotwell, of Columbia; Professors Daly, the geologist, and Monroe, the historian, of Harvard; Dean Gordon L. Lang, of the University of Chicago; Dean Sellery, of Wisconsin; and President Schurman, of Cornell, and numerous others.

However, when we wanted a man to put our National System of Railways on its feet, we called an American, who had already distinguished himself in railway administration in the United States and in Great Britain, Sir Henry Thornton. But while we borrowed much from you, we have also borrowed much from our Mother Country across the seas. And while we belong to a new type of political society in a new world, as you do, yet we are also tied by convictions and sympathy to the traditions of the ancient European State of Great Britain. For this reason I believe it to be within the reach of Canada to play some part in bringing closer together this ancient European State and the newer society of America, and perchance help to interpret the one to the other. We have so much in common with both you and our Mother Country of Great Britain that we are able to understand the point of view and peculiar difficulties of both. For instance when Mr. Chesterton—or let us say Mr. Zangwill—passes caustic comment on things American, on prohibition for example, we in Canada have a sympathetic understanding of the peculiar difficulties of your position, and hence recognise the superficiality and often injustice of the views expressed. For we in Canada have at least tried prohibition and know the practical difficulties of enforcing it that you encounter. Or, on the other side, when Mr. Hearst and his papers are engaged in the popular pastime of twisting the British lion's tail, we in Canada are the quickest to resent it and endeavour to correct the misrepresentations often made. I do not think that there is any harm in one nation criticising another. On the contrary, I think that it is often very beneficial and wholesome. But what does harm is the malignant intention to stir up ill feeling and create

discord. Sometimes school books foster this misunderstanding when they instill into the minds of the children of today the worn out passions of conflicts long since ended. Sometimes the press deliberately or unintentionally fosters misunderstanding when it places undue emphasis upon differences which are often superficial and overlooks the deeper causes for agreement. It seems to me that the Churches have a great opportunity just in this field, in educating our peoples to a more sympathetic understanding of each other, and thus help to keep sweet and wholesome public opinion. Is that not what Jesus meant when He said: "Ye are the salt of the earth?" In other words, did He not mean that the function of the Church was the function of salt, *i. e.*, to keep sweet and wholesome the life around us, as well as our relations with our neighbours?

We also believe that Canada might have a part in the important work of promoting international goodwill because we are a part of the British Commonwealth of Nations—one of the most unique experiments in international co-operation that the world has yet witnessed. For while a great deal is said about the efficacy of a League of Nations with which I find myself in substantial agreement; thus far the British Commonwealth of Nations is the most effective League of Nations that the world has yet seen. This great international experiment in which Canada, along with the other self-governing Dominions of the British Empire, is involved calls for rare qualities of statesmanship. Above all else it calls for tact, sympathy and intelligent understanding, a wide knowledge of world affairs. To the extent that this great experiment has succeeded it has succeeded because it has been founded

on justice and mutual goodwill. It means an intelligent understanding of our relation to the interest of a larger group, the subversion of special, sectional interests to the good of the whole. Not that I mean to imply that this is always done, or that this rule has always guided the component parts of the British Commonwealth of Nations in their relations to each other. Yet because of this relationship we have practical problems of international co-operation and mutual good will, to that extent will we have demonstrated to the world the possibility of a real League of Nations. Perhaps I might not be misunderstood if I say to you, our good friends in America, that because of this connection with world affairs as a part of the British Commonwealth we have, through no virtue of our own, but perforce, a wider outlook upon international affairs than is possible for your great nation at present. May I also say that we believe that our connection with the affairs of the old world is not detrimental, but is in every sense profitable to us, and that perhaps you might find in our experience that which might be helpful and reassuring to you in your consideration of world affairs and in your future relations to them. But whatever steps may in your judgment seem best, we may be assured that the Churches of our countries will always co-operate to create that enlightened, Christian, public opinion on which the peace of the world and the success of any machinery designed to secure it, must ultimately rest.

XXI

A MESSAGE FROM FRANCE

JULES JEZEQUEL,

General Secretary, National Union of Reformed Churches in France.

I AM very happy to have the opportunity of binding more closely the French Committee of the World Alliance to the American Committee.

I bring you the affectionate greeting of your friends of France. It will be most agreeable for me to tell my committee of all your kindness and of all the wonderful work you are doing.

I know how very kindly you welcome those who come to address you. I know also your devotion to all noble causes, your decision of mind, your earnestness at work, and I feel happy to pay homage to the high qualities of your grand Republic.

It gives me courage to speak to you, and above all to deliver my message.

We are here in a friendly atmosphere, since we are assembled by the World Alliance for promoting international friendship. International friendship! I wonder if this word strikes you; as for me it appears as something wonderfully new. A path that was never trod before, has just been opened before the nations of the world, and this path leads to the marvellous city whose inhabitants will all be brothers, and where a

lasting peace will reign, the city that we, the Christians, call the Kingdom of God.

I say that international friendship opens the way to that magnificent City. The reason is that international friendship alone can take us out of the terrible difficulties we are struggling with. Around us, peoples are fighting like dogs; a fight that never ceases, and that threatens to have no end, and to lead humanity to ruin. The only power capable of stopping the struggle is international friendship.

You have understood it, here in America, and you have founded the World Alliance. It will be an imperishable honour for America. But, allow me to tell you that we have understood it also, on the other side of the Atlantic. We have understood it, even in the country to which I belong with all my heart and soul, in sweet and noble France. A certain propaganda seeks obstinately to show her as militarist and imperialist. It is just as true as to say that the horse is a ruminating animal.

France has suffered terribly; ten of her richest provinces have been devastated, so that there remained nothing of some villages, and, in places, the arable land had disappeared. I do not speak by hearsay. I was there and I saw, with my own eyes, day after day, the ruins gathering. However, there is no hate in our hearts. Shall I give you a proof of it? Under the shock of the horrible sufferings of the war, a league was founded in France to promote and keep alive hatred against the aggressors. Nobody, nowadays, speaks of this league, but hundreds of thousands of men and women of my country, have entered the leagues that work for the League of Nations and for international friendship. Here, again, I can add that

I am not speaking by hearsay, but because I am a member of those leagues, and I know perfectly what is going on in my country for the promoting of a true and lasting peace.

I say a true peace; it means a peace whose foundations are right and justice. So speaking, I do not think I am unfaithful to the spirit of international friendship that I require, for there can be no sincere friendship where there is no justice.

The friendship alone is able to organise the nations into a League of Nations that would be, as we say in France, A Society of Nations, because it is founded on right and justice. I have just pronounced the fateful word of League of Nations. You expected that I should, did you not? We are very strongly in favour of the League of Nations in France. And for many reasons. First, because the idea of a Society of Nations is a French idea; I do not mean that it belongs to us, in fact it belongs to all civilised nations.

We are specially attached to it because of our love of clearness and logic. We are not pleased with talking vaguely of international friendship. Our spirit of logic claims that friendship should take a concrete shape, that it should be embodied in a definite organism.

Therefore it is not merely by enthusiasm that we are earnest partisans of the League of Nations, it is also after serious consideration, because it appears to us clearly as the logical end, as the crowning of the history of civilisation and as the supreme hope of our miserable humanity.

Therefore we desire a League of Nations, worthy of that name, complete and true. I confess that the one which sits in Geneva does not seem to us entirely satisfactory. It is rather a League of some Nations than a

League of all Nations; it does not emanate from nations, but from governments; it is weak, it has no power to enforce its decisions. All this is true.

But, under the pretext that the shrub does not give shade, are we going to cut it down? Is it not wiser to let it grow? Something exists that is called a League of Nations—it is an immense, a wonderful, a hardly-to-be-believed reality.

This wonderfully new organism is not yet such as we should desire, but good sense counsels us not to destroy it, but to surround it with care and with love, so that it may grow and become the beautiful tree that will shelter all the peoples of the world. Let us improve the League of Nations, that is to say, let us strengthen it.

Again here, we are drawn towards international friendship. It is the cornerstone of the League of Nations. We could, in fact, succeed in creating a League with means to enforce its decisions, we might have worked in vain, if we had not previously established between the nations the spirit of frank and loyal friendship.

The most urgent task consists, then, in the preparation of the foundations which are necessary for the true League of Nations. I mean this international friendship without which it would be a body without a soul.

With whom does this magnificent task rest, but with the Christian churches, depository of the teaching and of the will of Him who said "Love ye one another"?

It is their duty to fulfill this task.

Brothers of the United States of America—you have sent us the watchword, you have invited us to this

holy crusade—we express to you our deep gratitude. And we range ourselves by your side. We will walk at the same speed as you, towards the same aim. None other, more than this aim, is able to rouse the hearts. For what we are proposing is nothing less than to transform into human reality the word that flashes in the midst of Our Lord's Prayer, " Thy Kingdom come."

In order to reach this end, no effort must stop us, no pain must rebuke us. Nothing could excuse us if we did not act.

For the sake of the infinite sufferings of the past, for the sake of the glorious visions of the future, let us all unite with the forces of universal Christendom in order to establish brotherhood and establish everlasting peace.

XXII

A MESSAGE FROM GERMANY

GERMAN EMBASSY

Washington, D. C.,
November 13, 1923.

Dr. Henry A. Atkinson,
Bellevue-Stratford Hotel,
Philadelphia, Pa.

MY DEAR DR. ATKINSON:

I deeply regret not being able to attend in person the meeting of the American Council of the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches, and would ask you, therefore, to accept these few lines as a message of greeting on behalf of the German Government and the German people.

No organisation is so fitted to spread the message of peace and good-will among the nations of the world as the churches of Christ, and at no time was this message more sorely needed than today.

With all good wishes for the success of your meeting, I am, my dear Dr. Atkinson,

Yours very sincerely,
(Signed) O. WIEDFELDT,
German Ambassador.

XXIII

A MESSAGE FROM HUNGARY

GÉZA TAKARO,

Pastor, First Magyar Reformed Church of New York.

I AM bringing the most cordial greetings from the valley of the Danube.

From the terrible blood and tear deluge which flooded Europe, Hungary, for centuries the bulwark of Western culture against the barbaric invasions of the East, emerged as a badly shattered ark. From this ark, floating on the troubled waters of Europe, splashed by hostile waves, the carrier pigeon, the Hungarian Council of the World Alliance, has already been released several times, but the message the white dove brought would have suited the black raven better.

Now the message is full of expectation and hope. For the first time in five years we observe blue in the sky.

After many sympathetic speeches and articles about the Hungarian problem it seems the time for action has arrived. The foreign loan, which saved Austria, is now confidently expected by the other half of the dissolved Dual Monarchy, and due to this there is already a change of spirit in the populace. Shortly before the man who advocated friendly relations with the new neighbouring states on the grounds that our interests and very existence is interdependent, was libelled

as a traitor in the Hungarian parliament; and now the leaders of all parties loudly demand mutual understanding, and thus the ingress into the circulation of international relationships.

After the war, the two revolutions, the bloody terrorism of mob-rule, and the Roumanian invasion, the Hungarian looked about in his country like the farmer from the midst of his beaten and but sparsely upright wheat after the hailstorm. On the top of this came the Treaty of Trianon, which divided among the four neighbours more than two-thirds of a country, which had a glorious past extending over a thousand years and was geographically complete. Consequently most of our coal and timber, the entire supply of salt, gold and metals were given away.

Since that time deep ruts suggest sad occurrences. The roads leading to the heart of the country were worn by the countless thousands of refugees fleeing from the occupied territories. The exit roads were trampled by the emigrants fleeing the misery of the mother country. Once they proudly acclaimed: Extra Hungariam non est vita . . . and now immense numbers endeavour to emigrate, and as only very few can reach America, their coveted goal, they are scattered in the wide world like leaves in the chilly autumn breeze. For the past five years the cost of living rose sometimes hourly. Money has lost its value almost entirely, so that, for example, the printing of the 20 crown pieces was stopped, because it cost 25 crowns to do so. About forty per cent. of the population, including 200,000 cripples and innumerable widows, orphans, unemployed labourers and underpaid intellectuals, live in unbelievable misery.

In view of these facts it is no wonder the voice of

the wailing masses clamouring for bread was more audible than that of the Hungarian Council preaching peace. It is hard to make people forget Trianon, if it is in their dawn, daily work and sleep; if it robs their table of the necessities, blows out their light and extinguishes the fire of their hearth; if it interferes with their very life and hastens their death. The war fought half a century ago left in Europe's body a thorn, Alsace-Lorraine's annexation, which France was unable to forget in fifty years. Not less than four such thorns were thrust at once into Hungary's flesh by the world war, and as the wounds are still bleeding, forgetting is impossible. But for the sake of peace our Council is trying to make people endure them.

The Hungarian nation is at present celebrating a triple centenary.

A hundredth year anniversary of Petofi's birth, whose poems exalting patriotism and world freedom are read in thirty-six languages. Yet a pilgrimage cannot reach the spot where he exchanged his lyre for the sword so nobly drawn and wielded till his death for Hungarian independence, since Trianon is alien territory.

It is a hundred years since Madach was born, who also contributed to the world literature with his powerful philosophical drama, "The Tragedy of Man," in which, after taking us through the trouble-filled history of mankind, he recognises as the ultimate solution of all problems: God. We celebrate, again without pilgrimage, his birthplace, since Trianon is alien territory.

The Hungarian national anthem is a hundred years old today, but the birthplace of Kilcsey, its author, cannot be approached, since Trianon is alien territory.

It is impossible to forget these things, but for the sake of peace our Council is trying to make people endure them.

But the building of the golden bridge leading to the mutual understanding and peace would near completion so much quicker, if the work on both ends were hastened with equal enthusiasm. But this is not what we see.

I don't want to disturb the minds of the delegates with the exciting pictures drawn by American and English Church emissaries illustrating the fate of three and a half million Hungarians under alien rule. It is certain that the complaints of the local racial and religious minorities are not without reason. At the banquet held in New York last Saturday in honour of Archbishop Hayes, Supreme Court Judge Dowling praised very highly the loyalty of the Hungarian-born American citizens. What is the explanation of this? The fact, that they chose this wonderful country of their own volition, whereas they, over there, were forced to change allegiance.

Let us point to a characteristic fact instead of picturing exciting scenes.

The Hungarian Council for National Art Treasures appealed to the civilised nations against the wanton destruction of monuments in the annexed territories. In Transylvania, alone, were pulled down nine statues of Kossuth, whose eloquence was admired by Americans seventy years ago. More than fifty statues and monuments of authors, poets and heroes were already destroyed. Such destruction of statues is generally directed against the past. Thus it happened in old Rome, where the populace trampled upon the monuments of autocratic Emperors after their death. The

statues of kings in Paris during the revolution fell victims to the violent mob the same way. But the destruction has a different meaning in the occupied territories. Here the incentive is not the blind fury of the mob and it is not aimed at the past, but at the future.

The same force closes the schools from kindergarten to university, so that, for example, the famous parochial colleges of Transylvania have already closed their doors. Not only is the Hungarian language forbidden in education, but, for instance, in the Reformed Seminary of Kilozsaar even English is banished, though necessary for those students seeking education abroad.

Our World Alliance is performing its peaceful mission through the churches. It is feared, however, lest the Church be silenced gradually everywhere. It is already forbidden for the Protestants of Transylvania, these suffering Puritans of the present day, to have pastors in congregations numbering less than three hundred members, and most of these congregations are small, to be sure.

Great obstacles have to be overcome if we want to reach the lofty goal set out by the World Alliance in these parts of Europe. But we don't look solely upon the human side. On top of the Washington Monument I was presented with a description of it, from which I learned that the cornerstone of this majestically towering marble obelisk contains, among documents, an American silk flag and a Holy Bible. The Hungarian Council of our World Alliance is fully aware of the fact that the noble cathedral dedicated to international peace must have in its foundation, besides the national flags, that book, which raises us above all national boundaries into the universal brotherhood. By the

teaching of this book we are convinced that behind all national and international problems, reparations, disarmament, social questions, there is a supreme problem: the problem of the individual. Here lies the root of all evil. The road to recovery leads through this. And it is fortunate that the members of the Hungarian Council are mostly the same who started a few years ago the hopeful evangelisation movement for a general revival in Hungary.

This work is slower and harder, but it is the only one that leads to the goal. The work of one of the speakers of this conference, Dr. Nansen, was probably much easier, when he searched the frozen North, than it is seeking warm human hearts, endeavouring to break through the ice-fields of human selfishness and hatred.

But we know that nothing is impossible with God. And for this reason the white dove will return to the shattered ark of Hungary with the olive branch.

XXIV

A MESSAGE FROM JERUSALEM

PANTELEIMON ATHANASSIADES,

Archbishop. Representative of the Patriarch of Jerusalem.

MY dear Brethren, I come from Jerusalem, the city of peace, for the very word Uerushalaim means the city of peace. I come from Bethlehem, where for the first time, from the mouth of angels, was proclaimed the divine annunciation, "Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, goodwill to men."

All good Christians and all good men have opened their hearts and hid therein the great and invaluable treasure of the glad tidings of the natal night of Our Lord. All good Christians and all good men preserve in their minds and in their souls the divine message delivered to the poor and simple shepherds; and we who have been brought up and live in the sweetness of this hymn of hymns, treasure it deep down in our hearts and lives.

Even the religions of idolators and Gentiles have recognised the grandeur which the Angelic Ode contains, the ode of the night of the Three Wise Men.

If all religions did not adhere to the doctrine of Love and Peace, they would immediately cease to be religions, for all religions are established on Love and preach Peace.

On looking for the reasons for the differences which

exist amongst the various nations, one can not but take into serious consideration the main cause. Namely, their difference of language; and I would not be exaggerating if I state that the different means by which men express their thoughts and sentiments are the causes of perpetuating their differences in religion.

That this difference in language has many times provoked differences amongst men is decisively proven by the fact that great men in all ages have declared the necessity of unifying all languages for all peoples and in all climes. (Even religious reformers have been in favour of monolinguistism and against polyglotism.)

In the Ritual book of the Orthodox Eastern Church there is a prayer for the unification of all men and of all their thoughts. But it is realised that on account of climate conditions or for national or patriotic reasons the unification of all languages into one human tongue is a very hard task.

I, for one, can very well understand an American or an Englishman, for example, who insists on the preservation of the language in which Milton's "Paradise Lost" is written: Neither would I condemn a Greek if he refused to throw into the fire the winged words of Homer.

There are, as Dionysus of Syracuse has truly said, as many minds as there are men. Consequently, one would have to change the minds of each and every man if he would attempt to change their mother-tongue.

Let this suffice as far as it pertains to languages. Wars are made possible because of this difference in language, in expression, in thought. But there is one language which all men can speak, and that is the language of Jesus of Nazareth, and one form of expression which inspires and ennobles all thought, and

that is the language of Divine Love. In these, all races, tongues and colours can find expression—where Divine Love rules, peace reigneth.

Look at the other side of the picture, the alternative to Love and Peace. War, famine, disease, suffering, pain, tribulation, unrest and death. I will not tire you with a description of their destructive results, their pernicious influence on our civilisation and well-being. "Force always blunts the mind and the sentiments, even of the best men," Plato has said, and where previously blossomed and flourished love, peace, harmony —after war, devastation, horror, wretchedness, privation and degrading misery prevail.

I do not want you to consider me an Internationalist, or even a Socialist, because I speak thus of wars. However, in studying the causes of wars I find that the majority of these have been started and conducted in such a manner as to serve the material, and only the material, interests of certain groups of individuals. One, therefore, is forced to believe that wars are preceded by the corruption of the soul of man and by the rejection by him of every constructive idea.

Against this corruption and against this degradation, all Christian Churches must declare unconditional war. It is their duty; it is their business! The Christian Churches must once more undertake to uplift morally all humankind, they must undertake to inspire man in such a way that man shall become the real image of his Maker!

Before we clergy demand from the laymen to better the social conditions of this world, we, who have devoted our lives to the service of Our Lord, must condemn irrevocably all those who in the name of Christ declare war. Christ on the Cross forgave His enemies

and asked His followers to pray for those who persecuted Him.

No Christian nation can justify war, no matter how great the provocation, much less can the captains in the service of the Prince of Peace afford to disturb the peace which his religion provides for.

Let me, therefore, as a minister of Christ's Gospel, coming from the seat of the earthly home of the Saviour, from the land which saw His birth, His life and His death, urge upon you Christian people of this great Christian country the necessity for you of taking an active rôle in the establishment of peace. We are surrounded by deep undercurrents of confusion and discontent. Men are tired and sick and sore. Their souls are troubled within them. They cry peace, but there is no peace. They put forth their longing arms for rest and stability, but it is a shadow. Now is the moment when the Church of Christ all the world over should unite in one great effort to enforce peace. The Princes of God's Kingdom are stronger than the servants of destruction. Let us invoke the aid of the Saviour in our grand undertaking. Let us go humbly in our thoughts and souls to the Babe of Bethlehem, stand on the Field of the Shepherd, as doubtless many of you have stood in the flesh, and listen to the song of the angels.

"Peace on Earth, Good Will to men." This message cannot be false; it is true. It is a living force. God grant that each and every one of us may put his whole soul into the movement so that peace may reign, and as the festival of Christmas draws near with its message of "peace on earth and goodwill to men," let the Christian Churches and people of this great and glorious country of America lead the world in this

Holy Crusade. The world looks to you for a lead, do not disappoint the world. Above all do not disappoint Jesus Christ our Saviour, whose heart is bleeding now for the sorrows of the nations, and who is now saying, "America, is it nothing to you?"

God grant you may answer the call, God grant you may not be found lacking. May the Lord strengthen your arms and give you wisdom to do His will and achieve great things for Christianity.

XXV

A MESSAGE FROM SWEDEN

NATHAN SOEDERBLOM, D.D.,

Archbishop of Upsala.

ALTHOUGH discovered anew and described anew every month by a thousand explorers from Europe, and although being, through recent origin and steady influx, in its dominating blood and principles and traditions, European, America and the American mind seem to me to be today a secret and a wonder to Europe. It is no unusual thing that children grow much bigger and stronger and happier than their parents.

The elderly Swedish student who is asked to speak to you today was invited, in 1890, to attend a student meeting in New England, where he made life-friends, such as John Mott, A. A. Stagg and Wilfred Monod, and where he was deeply impressed both by the fundamental thoroughness of American hospitality, and by American religion in its most moving freshness in those heroes of revivalism, Dwight L. Moody and Ira D. Sankey. Since those memorable summer days I have had a definite idea of the United States' unique mission in history and of the might of the faithful Christian will of America, which is, humanly speaking, alone capable of giving our torn civilisation the strong lift it needs today.

A friend who wrote a book on your nation in the

making called the book "Dynamis," the Greek word for strength. Here we experience strength in prodigious things already accomplished, but you have a still more powerful impression of strength in the feeling that it is by no means exhausted from what it has done. It suggests to you that it is able to accomplish much more. One had that feeling here, you can imagine, when he felt the heart of this enormous organism beating.

One is aware of the huge possibilities of your new world. Strength of will and character needs a material for its manifestation; in the empty or emptied room every movement is paralysed. Here you feel air under the wings, if you have any.

You are the country of plenteousness, of abundance, of liberality, of a loyal, sometimes lavish, generosity. You have plenty of food. You cannot imagine the starvation in some parts of Europe. What you leave on your plates at each meal would be sufficient to feed one of the starving nations of Europe. There are millions of innocent children who scarcely know what milk is. There are men with glorious names in the history of research and humble servants of society, priests and deaconesses and labourers who never, or very, very rarely, see such luxuries as butter, cheese, milk or meat. Some groups of the population in Central Europe earn much money and spend much money. But those who chiefly bear up the intellectual and ethical ideals of a nation live under hardships that no one can imagine who has not seen them. Such people do not exhibit themselves. They hide their misery. Priests and professors take on hard manual labour in order to get food for their families and in order to be able to carry on their spiritual vocation in the hours

left them. But not all have the physical strength. It is no uncommon thing that a member of the highly educated class is found in his bed dead from starvation. He saved for his old age. But there to save is to waste, because money loses its value. When everything was sold he hid himself and his emaciated body from human eyes.

And there are many, many students at the universities of Austria, Germany and Russia who never eat but a single meal a day, and then a meal that you in this country, and we in Sweden, certainly would not call food for a human being. Still they are working hard, some of them with wonderful pluck.

We in Europe are close to this misery. And our neutral peoples cannot see such misery without helping, yea, without making real sacrifices. The last years have meant for my country a serious economic crisis, with unemployment and bankruptcy. But nevertheless relief work has been continued. And, as ever in real charity, the small people, not the millionaires, are the ones who accomplish the most. Since the Armistice, Sweden has contributed more than ten million dollars for relief work in Russia and other parts of Eastern Europe, in Central Europe and Belgium and France. And the other small neutral countries in Europe have made analogous sacrifices. You must remember that such a sum constitutes in reality more than twenty million dollars from your standpoint. Because you are the favoured part of humanity at present in that respect also, you are handicapping us with the value of your money. Sweden has the most expensive money in our civilisation today. But you get for one dollar in Sweden more than for two dollars in the United States. And you earn two dollars

in the United States more easily than one dollar in Sweden.

For a European who has, during the past seven weeks, been spoiled by magnificent hospitality in your country, it has been, therefore, a great comfort to read and hear how President Coolidge intends to continue the great Samaritan work of America for the starving people in Europe. Such generosity already accomplished or still at work and continued heals wounds and augments the moral trust of our menaced civilisation.

I read the other day, in an English paper, what Signor Guglielmo Ferrero, the great Italian historian, has written:

"There has never been so much money in the world, and the world has never felt so miserable. The goods of this world have never been so capriciously divided for the torment of rich and poor alike, for the unfortunate and fortunate. There are at the same time nations choked with abundance, and others dying of hunger. On the one side there are men despairing at their incapacity to buy, and, on the other, those who despair at being unable to sell. The price of corn has gone down, and famine is ravaging Russia."

Yes, indeed, if Europe had peace and was allowed to work for normal conditions, it would be necessary to put on the menus on the dining cars, "Eat more wheat." Ferrero continues:

"Not only the yellow races, but even the black people demand to be recognised and treated like the sons of God, and to be put on equality with the other members of the human family. All nations and classes appeal to Right and Justice, as if they all spoke the same language, but no one understands the others. . . ."

Just now Europe is very like an inflamed appendix of big Asia. Enormous microbes ravage it. Desperate hearts ask, Will an operation be necessary?

Do you remember another small organism in history which never came to any harmony, but which developed, in its different individual entities—towns and states—a brilliancy of human intellectuality, beauty and culture which has never been equalled? I mean Greece of antiquity. Dreams of peaceful settlements were never realised.

One of those Greek states, Macedonia, became, by and by, world-embracing, very much like the British Empire, if we carry the comparison so far. And further we might in the same way compare Sparta with Berlin, and Athens with Paris. Sparta and Athens never became reliable friends; we hope that Paris-Athens and Berlin-Sparta will be wiser.

But pious emigrants and bold adventurers went westward and founded in Rome a new commonwealth of their own, which knew later, it is true, an old indigenous culture, the Etruscan one, just as European emigrants and conquerors came into contact with old autochthonous civilisations in Central and South America. But as a whole Rome was, for a long time, a kind of colony of Greek civilisation before acquiring a power that at the end even controlled the glorious seats of ancient Greek splendour. Has not the Rome of antiquity its analogy in your United States in our present epoch? The sense of law and order, the development of the art of ruling and other qualities invite comparison.

If I take only the contribution given to this nation in the making by my own people, I find Swedish yeomen, of our best nobility, leaving their sometimes

wealthy homesteads for no other reason than the old, wistful, Viking mood, that wants to see what is beyond and perhaps the dream of a fresh Canaan for their piety; and I find poor men seeking greater possibilities, and I see lots of adventurers who had little to lose and much to gain.

History never repeats itself exactly, and I do not at all like to prophesy the future. We are always tempted to make too sweeping inferences from facts that overcome us suddenly and cover the horizon.

Harald Hjarne, the late great Swedish historian, in Upsala, foretold, in an article written in 1902, not only the supremacy of the United States, but even the rôle of your Union in the World War and in peace. He wrote: "America is a rejuvenated Europe, which, with its united force, pushes our old divided continent into the shade."

I think there is a very general sentiment in all Europe that America is part of the same civilisation, and that America has proved its solidarity in many ways, especially by participating in the last war. Only short sight can cut off the stem on which one has come into existence. With splendid, frank readiness your young men went into the war because of idealistic motives. The same idealism is obvious in the urgency with which Christian opinion in this country pleads solidarity in the actual complicated hardships of our western world, and is too profound for you to withdraw yourselves from the subsequent crisis of western civilisation. Will it be possible for this great continent to put the last ten years of its history into parenthesis? "The Atlantic has shrunk! It is no longer such a vast ocean as it used to be."

I find that when you go still farther west than San

Francisco, you say that you come to the East, to the Orient. I have been comforted by hearing that you thus include yourselves in our common European civilisation and do not wholly and piously despise our wicked, sinful old Europe.

In 1887 I heard in the Aula, the auditorium of the University of Upsala, the great Norwegian writer, Bjornstjerne Bjornson, say: "If Europe continues with wars (by the way, Sweden has had no war since Russia, in the midst of peace, went into Finland one hundred and fifteen years ago and took it), they will telephone from America, 'Keep still, down there in the nursery!'" He might rather have said, "Keep order, please, in 'the old folks' home'!" Since that time the United States have had too many wars themselves for such a message. Nothing is more dangerous for a great and bold conception than to be hampered at its very start by weakness or any other kind of shallowness. America graciously gave to the European world, in the peace of Versailles, the League of Nations. Shall I say that it was a gracious gift? Is it not truer to say that it was a "cadeau" urged upon somewhat reluctant recipients? Many of us in Europe hailed it, though, as the dawn of a new day. It seems to us that such a gift implies a certain responsibility on the part of the giver. Through its withdrawal from the society it has itself founded, the generous giver has risked the future of the great idea itself. The last years have corroborated such a view in a way disastrous to mankind. It is not the fault of the idea itself, that the League of Nations is too weak today. It ought to have been stronger.

Lord Robert Cecil, the noble statesman, who more than anybody else incarnates the idea of the League of

Nations, said, in the words of the man in the Gospel: "I believe, help my unbelief." No Christian believer can abandon the hope for a better and higher international policy than the actual one. But for such a goal the big, hearty, good, strong will of America is urgently needed. In one form or another, such a co-operation will be able to give to western civilisation a somewhat safer future.

Before the war I saw in the "Simplicissimus" a cartoon representing two farmers, one French, one German, labouring in the sweat of their brow, in the ground on each side of a river. They looked rather exhausted, each carrying on his back a soldier in his whole warrior's array—a heavy burden, indeed. Suddenly one of the farmers asks the other, "Why do we carry these two on our backs; is not our work heavy enough without them?" The other answers, "People say that if we get rid of them, we two, you and I, shall kill each other."

The calamity happened in spite of that costly preventive machinery. The calamity was not ended by peace. I was struck last year by a sentence in St. Augustine's "De Civitate Dei," "Pax cum bello de crudelitate certavit ac vicit." Seeing the unrest and ravage and curse of so-called peace, we must not forget any who laboured that bloodshed might cease.

Last year, an American, a professor of political economy, told us at the International Church meeting of the World Alliance, in Copenhagen, that there are today in our western world about one million soldiers more than before the war, although the powers are disarmed.

Bayonets may be necessary in this wicked world and useful at some turns of history, but Lasalle, the labour

leader, said to Bismarck: "Bayonets may be good for many things, but you cannot be seated on them."

The safety of the world must be founded on sincerity and confidence, not on arms. Am I right when I experience here in this New World a greater, more generous trust both in the individual man, in other peoples and in the future of mankind than is to be found generally in the Old World, to which I belong with all my heart?

It is no exaggeration to state that of all the political conferences held after the war the only one which inspired some hope to mankind and to the Christians who believe in the brotherhood of nations as well as of individuals, was the Washington Conference. The world needs more initiative of that kind.

Nationalism has proved to be too much of a heathen. The Church of God has here a heavy responsibility. It has not as a whole carried nationalism to the baptismal font, although there have been many magnificent efforts made by individual Christians and by groups of Christians.

I am no cosmopolitist. I believe in concrete and blood-rich life, not in pale abstractions. I think that every nation, being a person, a servant, a necessary participant in God's plan with the world, has to keep faithful to its own soul. Mankind thus becomes richer. But patriotism must become baptised. It must not imply the presumed right and duty of a nation to do any harm to others for the benefit of narrow-minded and mistaken selfish interests, as President Butler said in his searching speech the other day. Christianised patriotism means that. Feeling, as did Christ and St. Paul, the most intimate solidarity with my nation, I put before it the highest ideals that can be cherished

by any nation on earth. Searching prophets, whose truths were disagreeable to their nation while it was drunk with nationalism, and who, perhaps, suffered opposition, yea, persecution, constitute by and by the honour and the glory of their nations.

Have you heard about an accident which happened some years ago in Europe? Usually your papers give plenty of space to accidents. A child was born, a child with prodigious possibilities and a great soul. But it was a cripple child even at birth, and it was repudiated by its own father. The mother is left alone with the sick child, which she never really wanted. Whose duty is it to take care of a cripple child? Its father's, I should think. But, alas, it is no uncommon thing that a father denies paternity.

The name of that child is the League of Nations. Who is the father? The answer is obvious. The father of that child is the United States of America. But the father turns a deaf ear to the crying infant. Europe, the poor mother, is left alone with the child.

Now the question is urgent. There are only two alternatives. Shall that child be left to die and make room for another stronger child with the same prodigious calling? Or will the father recognise his duties and help to bring up the child?

Here in this country I have found that some of the best men of your nation—best, also, because they are thoroughly American to the very core of their being, not in any way half-hearted—among such men who approach nearest, as far as I can see, the American ideal, I have found the most convinced and solid champions of America's solidarity with Europe.

Here the question is needed, Do you believe in the federalist principle, in a super-state in one form or

another, in a wider, organised federation for peace? Or do you share the views of those who one hundred and more years ago, found it absurd and unpatriotic to say that Virginia and Massachusetts should belong to the same union? Your momentous commonwealth of states constitutes the greatest application in history of the federalist principle. And nothing grander has been achieved in the domain of politics, during several centuries, for the sacred cause of peace, than this Union of States. Why should not the federalist principle be applied in one form or another to a larger part of humanity? Guglielmo Ferrero sees in the United States of Europe the only salvation of our doomed, or at least thunder-riven, old European world. And he sees that America has its hour as never before in history. Here the Church of Christ is concerned. Because the Bible is the document on real peace and on world peace. The Bible teaches peace through right and law, instead of war. Many of us in Europe have praised God during the last few years for the admirable efforts made by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America to promote the entrance of the United States into the League of Nations.

Here the task of the Church comes in. A commonwealth of nations, to be realised in the improvement and growth of the actual League of Nations or in new shape, must have a Christian soul. Without a soul, without a generous inspiration in the hearts of the nations in it—in spite of all cleverness—a dead body, a machine. And if it does not get a Christian soul, it easily becomes a devil.

We witness in some quarters of Europe a spiritual renewal, a keen sense of the craving for the Master, a resolute, yea, heroic following of the Master, in ma-

terial poverty and in mental richness worthy of the Gospel. And those who go deep into the secret of a Christ-like life beneath the surface of worldliness and private or collective selfishness feel keener than others the folly of our divisions, of the lack of organisation and common action in evangelic Christendom. We must have clear and common principles as to the application of the Christian spirit to international and national life.

No one has better defined our scope on international life than your late lamented President Harding on his western trip while stopping at Colorado Springs: "I tell you, my countrymen, the world needs more of the Christ, the world needs more of the Man of Nazareth, and if we could bring into the relationships of humanity, among ourselves and among the nations of the world the brotherhood that was taught by the Christ we would have a restored world, we would have little or none of war, and would have a new hope for humanity throughout the earth."

And your President Coolidge, lately in Washington, speaking on national life, said: "But certainly it has a need of a greater practical application of the truths of religion. It is only in that direction that there is hope of solution of our economic and social problems."

It is no chance that such words are spoken by these men and by earlier Presidents of the United States. It is characteristic of the rôle played by religion in this country and of its wonderful destiny in the world.

Need I emphasise those points where much is lacking in our international and national life. In my recent book on Christian Fellowship I have tried to elucidate the whole historic and practical problem of a united hope and work of Christendom.

1. The brotherhood of nations has not, as yet, its due place in the teachings of the Church. The Church should not only teach and preach against private selfishness, but even against collective selfishness, nationalism, in catechism and school. Jesus, in His little story, lets a Samaritan be the only helping man, a Samaritan who was despised and hated by the Israelites. In the same way would Jesus have said in Paris, that the French deputé and the French lady passed by, but a German workman helped the Frenchman in distress. Likewise, German children should be taught that first came a German professor and he passed by, and then came a priest and he passed by, and likewise a business man, but then came a French officer, and he helped the robbed and sick Teuton. In Sweden, Jesus might have taken a Russian illustration, and here in this country, a black man or a Japanese.

There is a good way of learning to know a foreign country. When you come to a foreign country read the text-books on history in its schools. You will find the same event described and the same man judged in quite different ways in different countries. Is not truth everywhere the same? We ought everywhere to use text-books that teach the truth, and nothing else.

But take the actual text-books after the war. I dare not tell you the horrors that I have seen. But I have also seen honest efforts to be truthful and to kill in the hearts of children thoughts of revenge and to sow the seed for a better future, for a real peace.

We have already begun that comparative study. And the world will be able to see, and judge, what children are taught in different countries. Because this is a matter which concerns mankind. Poison must not be allowed to spread freely.

2. The Church must recognise its task and its duties also in the sphere of economic and social life. At present reigns a chaos in that respect in the Church. One priest says, "A true Christian must be a socialist." And another says, "A Christian must oppose socialism, because private property is necessary for the development of character and responsibility." A third says, "The Church has nothing to do whatever with economics." Of course that is all wrong. Christ Himself talked and taught much about Mammon. The Church cannot commit herself to an economic theory. But Christendom must get a common vision on those things —a common voice for its conscience and a common hand for its action in national and in international life.

I could mention other problems. Religious minorities are oppressed in several places. Our World Alliance is doing a splendid work. But more is needed. Starvation and privation ravage large parts of our civilisation. Splendid relief work has been done. But more is needed, joint action is needed.

Nearly sixteen hundred years ago, in Nicea, was held the Council on Dogmatics. It formulated a creed for the whole future of the Church. Now we need a Nicea on ethics, on life and work.

XXVI

A MESSAGE FROM CHINA

Y. Y. TSU, PH.D.,

General Secretary, Chinese Students' Christian Association of North America.

RELIGIOUS symbolism is a means whereby we express our best thoughts, our biggest hopes and our highest aspirations. Different nations and races have their own religious symbols. To the Christian nations of the West the figure of the Christ and His Cross embodies all that is noblest and beautiful and worth while in life and its relationships. It stands for the ideals of sympathy, human brotherhood, unselfishness, love. But how often our action contradicts our own idealism. What anomalies we find in our Christian lives. The Universal Christ—how often we have made Him partisan, sectarian, ecclesiastical and even nationalistic. We make Him join our quarrel, fight our battles and share our ambitions and jealousies. In our meddlesome littleness we make Him wear our clothes.

In China and the other countries of eastern Asia, there is another religious figure which sums up and symbolises all that is noble and beautiful in the human heart. It is the figure of the Buddha. It stands for peace, compassion, mercy, human kindness. It combines the quality of the mother-heart for the new-born babe, the magnanimity of the victor toward a fallen foe

and the compassion of the good toward the erring. This figure of the Buddha is enshrined not merely in the temples throughout China, Japan, Korea and the southern countries of eastern Asia, but also in the hearts of millions in those countries.

As I compare the figure of the Christ of the West and the figure of the Buddha of the East how similar they appear to me in many aspects, for when I try to express what is fundamental in human goodness, we stand on common ground.

The universal quest of mankind today is not for the Golden Fleece or the Holy Grail, but for peace and goodwill. It is the function of the Christian Church to let loose the spirit of the Christ so that it will once more pervade and brood over the face of the earth. Perhaps the contribution of the Christians of Asia will be a fresh appreciation and understanding of the Universal Christ.

XXVII

A MESSAGE FROM JAPAN

TADAKAZU UWOKI,

Japanese Student in the United States.

IT is a great privilege to say something from the standpoint of Japan, before this important meeting.

When President Harding called the Washington Conference on Reduction of Armament, there arose various opinions about it in Japan, ensuing in a country-wide turmoil. One powerful outcry was that "A national calamity has come." It is natural that narrow-minded nationalists were supporters of this view. They thought it nothing but a wayward policy of powerful countries to hinder the righteous and inevitable way of a small country, leading at last to the latter's destruction, and there was some opposition to Japan's sending delegates. At the same time, an optimistic outcry was heard, that "A national opportunity has come." Observing a change of mood among the world diplomats, some men of insight advised that a frank and open-hearted attitude toward this problem would solve various troubles. Christian churches stood strongly for this position, and they earnestly prayed for its success.

What Baron Kato did at the Washington Conference shows a remarkable advance in Japan. For about ten years before that, when the Carnegie Peace Foundation

invited delegates from Japan to attend a conference at Berne, Switzerland, the then Prime Minister, Prince Katsura, had nothing to tell the delegates who were going to attend it, except that they were to hear the discussions, and on receiving the report the Japanese government would decide some policy.

Christian churches in Japan rejoiced to see the result of the Washington Conference, perceiving in it a better hope for the world, teaching at the same time, an optimistic trust of other nations in the modern ideal of world politics.

In spite of some opposition, the effect of the Washington Conference upon the Japanese was wholesome and helped to further the international spirit throughout the country. Peace movements began to appear. During the year 1922, the National Peace Council was organised, including nine large organisations—the Japan Peace Society, the League of Nation's Association, the Y. M. C. A., the Y. W. C. A., the Women's Peace Society, the W. C. T. U., the National Association for Reduction of Armament, the International Education Association, and the Japan Council of the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches. Beside these there have been formed several other agencies to promote international understanding, the Sino-Japanese Association, the Japan-American Association, the Japan-France Association, and others.

But a regrettable fact is the prevailing indifference and ignorance about this problem. The peace movement has not enlisted the enthusiastic support of the general public. It seems to me to be the general consensus of opinion in Japan that the earthquake about Tokyo is a heavenly visitation. Because, while many

nations are struggling under a heavy damage caused by the world war, Japan has been enjoying war-profits in lax living. The earthquake is a warning from heaven that they must be awakened from the easy-going atmosphere. This is a general sentiment both within and without the Church. We have reason to be thankful if the terrible misfortune serves to stimulate the people to a higher and nobler life, not to speak of the beautiful expression of humanity all over the world toward the stricken people. At any rate you can understand why the peace movement was not being taken up in earnest in Japan.

A more serious problem and a great hindrance is the disbelief about Christendom and Christianity. The world war was a great shock to the Japanese non-Christians, as well as Christians. The Japanese have always looked up to the western countries. Very naturally Christian churches have idealised American and English churches. It is discouraging that such an European conflagration could occur. Christianity has turned out to be nothing but a national religion, and the Christian Church the servant of the state! How difficult it was for us to explain our standpoint during the war. Japanese Christian churches have stood for internationalism. Ten years ago Dr. Ebina, now the president of the Doshish University, stood forth as an exponent of internationalism in the face of the opposition of the narrow-minded nationalists, and I personally know a native Christian who was imprisoned because he refused to go to war. Japanese Christians believe in Christianity and in the Church's power. But we must fight against such an ominous disbelief.

The Peace Movement in Japan is a movement very much outside the Church. This may be a natural phe-

nomenon, for there are only three Christians to every 1,000 non-Christians. Yet it is not too much to say that the leading spirit and enthusiasm is Christian. The Christian Church must vitalise it, else it will lose its burning enthusiasm: and I have a confidence in the Japanese young people who have Christian idealism in a purer form. The Christian churches have struggled, and are still struggling, for their self-existence. But we ought to be ashamed to say so. We must work hard to form a stronger organisation for effective work. We must accomplish a thoroughgoing propaganda in order to kindle a nation-wide enthusiasm for this urgent problem. For our aim is not simply to promote a bit of international courtesy. We must stop war.

The Japanese are admirers of foreign countries. They love things from abroad better than those produced in their own land. They will buy things from abroad even if more expensive, simply because they love them. But now they have a hesitation about the best thing you can offer. The Japanese look to America as an unmistakable example of the Christian ideal, good or evil. Show us, therefore, a beautiful example, then the task will be half done.

XXVIII

A MESSAGE FROM MEXICO

HERBERT M. SEIN,

Mexican Student in the United States.

IT is a joy for me to address you this morning on the subject of "Mexico and World Peace." I appreciate the earnestness of your endeavour to promote friendship between peoples of different lands. When I think of the unequalled racial make-up of your mighty nation, made possible by the human contributions from many lands, and when I consider the sturdy quality of the idealism of the makers of this republic, I do not wonder that you feel urged to reach out hands for cordial handshakes with your near and distant neighbours. Neither do I hesitate to say that the hand that you extend is strong and warm with love for mankind.

The world is mindful at this moment of the great lack of harmony among the governments of the world. The selfish forces of intrigue and violence are still at work. Hearts that are sensitive to the exasperating situation of world affairs are still looking to the distant horizon for hope. They search for a light to lead us kindly out of this bitter, cruel, tangle of self-inflicted misery.

You have purposed to stretch your hands of friendship across seas and borders; as a young Mexican I welcome the handshake of cordiality that you offer my

people. As your friendship for my country grows, so must your understanding of my people increase. You must have a deeper understanding of Mexico and her problems, if you really want your altruistic efforts to help her upward. (It's funny, but nearly every country of the world is saying the same thing; somehow the rest of the world wants the United States of America to understand her.)

My country has a long history, and though I speak of Mexico as a new world, I pause to say that it is a "World wrongly called the new! this clime was old when first the Spaniard came, in search of gold. Age after age its shadowy wings had spread, and man was born, and gathered to the dead; cities arose, ruled, dwindled to decay, empires were formed, then darkly swept away. . . ."

I want you to think of Mexico as a people. During my stay in this land I have asked many persons: "What does Mexico mean to you?" Not a few have replied: "Well, it's a good country for mining oil; a few fortunes have already been made around Tampico." Others have said: "Mining down there pays pretty well, but with laws we could do a greater business." Such concepts of Mexico held by some people of great riches are very poor. I beg you to think of Mexico not in terms of gold, silver, oil or profits, but in human terms. Yes, think of Mexico as a people; for my country is briefly a people of Indian and Spanish blood struggling from ancient civilisations through foreign conquest, superstition, ignorance and exploitation to a self-achieved independence, education and prosperity.

Mexico has not yet achieved its liberation from foreign exploitation and internal disorders. Its history is marked by a constant social and political activity.

Before the conquest by Cortez, in 1521, the native tribes battled among each other on and about the plateau of Anahuac. Through the period of Spanish expansion the conflict between the natives and the invaders continued. In 1810 began the eleven year war for independence from Spain, which was followed by civil strife, the war with the United States and the subsequent seizure of half of Mexico's territory; then came the pre-Juarez revolutions, the Constitution of 1857, the French invasion under Napoleon III, the post-Juarez disturbances, the Diaz dictatorship and the iron-fist suppression of guerilla warfare. These activities were followed by the Madero revolution, in 1910, his assassination, the success of the revolution under Carranza, his overthrow by a bloodless revolt, and since then a popular peace. However, it is not impossible that political disturbances will again occur, but with less frequency and of shorter duration, at least that is what we hope. I would not have you think, for one moment, that my people have suddenly become angels or sweet, docile children. Not at all.

This incessant activity has been aiming at four things:

1. The political independence of Mexico.
2. The establishment of democratic government.
3. The control of the natural resources and emancipation from foreign exploitation.
4. The creation of the new Mexican people.

The first of these four aims, the political independence of Mexico from Spain, was achieved a hundred years ago. Since then the relations between Mexico and Spain have been cordial, with the exception of the time during which Spain gave her support to the invasion of Mexico by Napoleon III.

The second goal, the establishment of democratic government, has not yet been reached. Such an event requires a great preparation of the soil. I know that you and many of my countrymen are anxious that this should be realised soon. Some people become impatient, saying: "Can't the Mexicans establish a democracy?" But democracies do not grow over night like mushrooms. Education of the right sort has to penetrate the masses; men must have a common ground of knowledge, and individuals must be bound together by a common social aim. You pugnacious Anglo-Saxons must be patient! In Mexico the meaning of government and power requires a new interpretation differing from that which viceroys, emperors and dictators have inculcated. Then, too, the concept of citizenship with the significance of its privileges and responsibilities, and the spirit and methods of teamwork have to saturate the body politic.

The third aim, the control of the natural resources and the emancipation from foreign exploitation, is a just and honourable desire of any freedom-loving people. Lives there the man who would like to see the chief fountains of the economic life of his native land in the control of foreigners, no matter how much more efficient business men they may be than his own? This national desire finds expression in different ways. It is significantly voiced in certain indispensable articles of the Constitution of 1917. Naturally these articles are not very savory to certain well-known interests of that walled street that, like some of its financiers, needs more sunlight. Mexico wants to share her rich natural resources with the nations of the world; her storehouses are open to aid the progress and well-being of mankind. But Mexico will not stand for economic

subjugation and foreign exploitation. Because of Mexico's economic weakness she has at times found herself in embarrassing circumstances. During a rather long period of industrial transformation that she must undergo, she must guard zealously her ownership of the natural resources, lest some day Mexico find that she is owner only of her name, her songs and a few corn fields; while citizens of other nations virtually own her natural resources, and control her industrial and financial life. The great accumulation in this country of capital awaiting profitable investment will be attracted southward. But the purchase of much property by Americans in Mexico might prove to be, in later years, a temptation to seize more Mexican territory. It is noticeable that the citizens of other foreign countries in Mexico become naturalised more frequently than the citizens of this nation. As long as Americans making fortunes in Mexico fail to become her citizens, and thus aid her progress, there is only one wise course left for Mexico, that is, for Mexico to become strong within her borders, to gradually put a stop to foreign concessions and acquisitions of property, to withdraw her aid to the industries and internal commerce of foreigners, and to foment intensively the increase and development of the industries of her own citizens. Such a program is not anti-American nor anti-foreign; it is simply pro-Mexican.

The fourth goal of the constant social and political activity is the most spiritual of all. It is the formation of a new Mexican people. Oh! that you might sense the thrill that comes to a nation with the awakening of its multitudes! The last decade of revolution has tried the souls of men and has brought in a new social conscience. The man of the masses, the former peon that

was bent dustward, now stands up and says: "I, too, am a man." And the womanhood of my land has caught a new vision! An era of new life has begun for her. It is this new social conscience that is responsible for the present labour, feminist and agrarian movements. States and municipalities propose programs for the betterment of the masses. Schools, libraries, hygiene, sanitation, better homes and better roads are now discussed by labour unions and town councils. Whoever may be the next president, and whatever his platform may be, he will have to reckon with organised labour and its eagerness to experiment with new social programs in its quest for welfare and advancement.

This is, in brief, the meaning of the social and political activity that has continued for several centuries among the Mexican people. During the last half century, in spite of the losses of property and life suffered by American citizens in Mexico, and the recent invasions of Mexican territory by United States forces, the relations between the two republics of North America have continued, generally speaking, with friendliness and mutual confidence.

However, a Mexican can sense the possibility of further international conflict. Since 1916 the United States has been giving a tone of definiteness to its policy of intervention and control of the Caribbean land and water areas. Haiti, Santo Domingo, the Virgin Islands, Panama, the Great Corn and the Little Corn Islands, and Nicaragua are considered by some Mexicans as the stepping stones to a greater control and ultimate possession of the little Caribbean World. The explanation that such intervention has always been for the sake of peace, health and education does not hide the estimate of the United States War Depart-

ment of the strategic value of these possessions, not to mention the commercial and political importance of the islands of the Mediterranean of America. In pursuance of this policy the State Department has come to be the agent of American financiers and commercial enterprises in these countries. It looks out for the advancement of their interests, and indirectly the growth of American commercial, political and military control. Thus continues, through treaties and special privileges, the rapid undermining of the sovereignty of these small republics. Hence, the charge of imperialism brought against the United States, whose policy appears to receive the backing of the great interests of the nation.

I am a young man, therefore, I cannot be a pessimistic prophet of doom and destruction. But I will speak fearlessly and deliberately. I feel that the pursuance of this policy of intervention and control is the surest way to undermine the friendship that now exists between Latin America and this country. We Mexicans view with concern the semi-circle of American military power that in recent years has been formed to the east of Mexico. We cannot but be anxious at times lest tomorrow, when an unforeseen situation handicaps us, this stretching cordon of power may completely surround and absorb the Republic. The rest of Latin America is beginning to regard this encroachment with marked disfavour. Fifty years from now a stronger and more united Latin America will be restive as a consequence of this policy of infringement of the liberty of small American nations.

This is Mexico's relation to World Peace. Mexico's responsibility in this great cause is to first establish peace, justice and freedom within her boundaries, and next to discourage the giant eagle of the north from

sowing further the seeds of international discontent and conflict. Let the youth of both Americas awake to see the vision of a Warless Western World; and on the basis of a firm mutual respect with goodwill, patience and co-operation the two Americas shall learn to love each other more truly and to better fulfill their glorious mission to mankind!

XXIX

A MESSAGE FROM SWITZERLAND

ANDRÉ BOUVIER,

Swiss Student in the United States.

IF words could express the feelings which I entertain before this august assembly, representing not only the American Christian movement, but also several churches of all parts of the world, I should remind you of a remark made 300 years ago. When the Mayflower was ready to sail, as the heroic pilgrims were going to bid farewell, in a great adventure of faith, Rev. Robinson gave to his parish final words of encouragement, saying: "The Lord has more truth yet to break forth out of His Holy Word." Yes, in regard to this very congress, which is a manifestation of faith and hope, which is an act, I should say: Robinson's affirmation was prophetical, and is still going to be realised.

As a delegate from Switzerland and a native of Geneva, I am delighted to bring to you a fraternal and faithful message from my own country, and especially from the city which was formerly called the protestant Rome.

The very day I arrived, glancing at the walls of Union Theological Seminary, (which was built by Presbyterians) the first thing which I noticed was the coat of arms of Geneva. That is why it seems to me not difficult to express to you the friendship

of a country which is small in territory, but great in history.

Of course you know that above our Genevese Arms there are three letters: the monogram of Christ, J. H. S. In spite of the dark chapters of our religious history, we have tried to keep in our hearts the world-wide ideal symbolised in these three letters. The Church of Switzerland is aware what a big task is her own, what a responsibility she has thrust upon her, being miraculously saved from the horrors of war.

Our Christian endeavour today is expressed in this simple word: Love. We know it has to be kind, we know that real love "envieth not, vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not its own, and finally rejoiceth with the truth."

One of our great duties and privileges nowadays is to relieve the sister churches in distress. The World Alliance Committee has given to the Federation of the Swiss Churches this peculiar task. It is only a few months ago since Dr. Adolf Keller received in this country the warmest welcome, so that he could go home with more hope to succeed and more power to act.

Another duty which the Swiss churches have considered and are going to consider more and more, is the duty of brotherhood in international welfare.

Here again we are greatly obliged to America and to Christianity in this country, for one of your most representative men has designed Geneva as the residence of the League of Nations. To us Woodrow Wilson was the incarnation of the highest Christian ideals in America and in mankind.

In the Eighteenth Century, J. J. Rousseau, as citizen of Geneva, called himself citizen of the world. In the Twentieth Century, a few years ago, the government

and church of Geneva believed that this title should be granted to the man who laid the real foundation of peace and brotherhood in the world . . . and, accordingly, they presented to Mr. Wilson this honorary citizenship of our little commonwealth.

There are many spiritual bonds between Switzerland and America. Our relationship is being increased by the work of the World Alliance and the common interest of common ideals. A proof of it is the very subject which calls this conference together: the Permanent Court of International Justice is as close to our minds as to yours. That is why I cannot refrain from saying in conclusion: We have another device to offer to you. I know nothing which can better express its significance and efficiency: Post Tenebras Lux . . . after the Darkness, Light!

XXX

RESPONSE TO THE MESSAGES

PETER AINSLEE, D.D.,

Pastor, Christian Temple, Baltimore, Md.

IT is a pleasant and easy assignment to stand in the midst of friendly voices and to say, Welcome. We hail these who have spoken to us as the evangelists of international good will. It is pre-eminently the function of the Church to catch up the weakened cords in our international relations and to make international friendship a permanent achievement in the experience of mankind.

The great physical cables that lie at the bottom of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, bringing Europe, Asia, and America into a daily conference room, are but parables of the social, education and spiritual cables that bind the nations of Europe, Asia and America into a permanent friendship. These are realities, and the voices to which we have just listened give strength to these realities.

We Americans think of Great Britain as our mother. Our forbears, who laid the foundation of this republic, first bore her flag before they lifted the stars and stripes. From her we got our language, our law, our history, our literature, and our religion. The statue of George Washington in the gardens of the Royal Art Gallery facing Trafalgar Square, the statue of Abraham Lincoln on a London thoroughfare, and the bust

of Henry W. Longfellow in Westminster Abbey are reminders that the mother country is strengthening the cable of our friendship, so that it is already impossible to think in terms of war between Great Britain and America.

Canada lies as close to us as one of the States in the Union lies to another. We pass as unconsciously across her borders as we pass across the Mason and Dixon Line in the States. Her heritage and ideals are common with our own. There is no finer monument in the world and none whose moral grandeur exceeds in height that monument of a surveyor's line of three thousand miles between Canada and the United States without fortifications on either side. Out of the Jay Treaty of 1794 and 1795 the Canadian boundary became a pledge of justice and goodwill, so that we of these two nations would count it sacrilegious to have set up on this border ugly cannon proclaiming suspicion and hate.

We are glad to have the letter from the German Ambassador, but we miss those sterling Germans who have sat in our World Alliance meetings from the beginning—Dr. Deissman, Dr. Seigmund-Schultze, Dr. Spiecker and others. Not only are there many millions in America who came from Germany, or whose forbears came from Germany, but Americans are indebted to Germany for its thought in science, education and religion. We have sat at her feet with profit, and she has shared with us her learning. American Protestantism gracefully acknowledges its debt to the German monk of Wittenberg.

There has been a friendship between France and America from the day that we became a republic. No picture of immediate post-Revolutionary times is more vividly recalled than that of Washington clasping hands

with Lafayette at Mt. Vernon. It is no meaningless sentiment that across America may be found the name of Lafayette, for in cities, countries, and streets, it is associated with that of Washington. Indeed, America's debt to France is incalculable. The ideals that gave rise to this republic came from the mind of that distinguished French philosopher, Jean Rousseau, the spiritual son of John Calvin, and his influence was felt by the framers of the American constitution as though he sat among them. We think of France in terms of international friendship.

The brief history of the republic of Hungary, rising in the very heart of Europe, has been the admiration of America. Her distinguished Kossuth brought the first association of Hungarian interests with that of America. We have not forgotten him; we have incorporated him as a part of our history; so that we think of him far beyond monuments of brass. These may be overturned by hostile hands of new alignments in Europe, but let us hope that it is a prophecy of the overturning of all military monuments until these are replaced with statues in civilian clothes, for it is not to the credit of these times for our cities to be adorned with statues of men with pistols and swords. Civilian occupations, and not wars, have made nations.

We receive with appreciation the greetings from the most ancient Church of Christendom. The Eastern Orthodox Church not only antedates all other churches, but holds in its territory those lands sacred in Scriptural records. They speak the language of the first Christians, and, if we were to name the most outstanding Christian preacher of the post-apostolic times, we would say with them it was Chrysostom. With them we claim a kinship in our eagerness to find a pathway

through the centuries back to the Christ when He lived in the days of His flesh. We recall most pleasantly the presence of representatives of the Eastern Orthodox Church at our St. Beatenberg meeting, and now welcome these representatives and their co-operation in seeking to establish international friendship through the Churches.

Sweden is bound to America by several millions of her countrymen, who have found their citizenship in America. We have no finer type of American citizenship than those of Scandinavian origin. When we think of Swedish history, instantly there comes before us Gustavus Adolphus, whose career was not as romantic as that of the Bernadotte, but whose wisdom and vision made him the most outstanding European sovereign of his day. He was interested both in international friendship and Christian unity. The mantle of these ideals is worn today by Archbishop Soderblom, the most distinguished occupant of the ancient See of Upsala, who has carried them farther and expressed them finer than his famous sovereign. We think of the Archbishop as the foremost prophet of international goodwill and Christian unity on the continent of Europe, whose voice has gone in many languages to all parts of the world.

There is a cable of moral appreciation between China and America that is growing stronger with the years. When John Hay proposed returning the Boxer indemnity, in 1908, it was laughed at in diplomatic circles of some of the nations. China used the money for educating some of her young men in America. Now England and Japan have seen the wisdom of Hay's policy. Since China has become a republic, even though many difficulties surround its permanent establishment, there

has been a growing friendship dating from John Hay's friendly attitude toward the welfare of another nation. In addition to that the multitude of American missionaries have brought China close to America, so that the Pacific Ocean has wonderfully shrunk.

When Commodore Perry cast anchor in the waters of Yokohama, in 1852, let us think of its as a parable of America's casting the anchor of friendship in the heart of Japan. Race differences frequently close our appreciation of each other, but in the light of the gospel of Christ we come to see that God hath made of one all nations, and that our task is to remove misunderstandings and to make international friendship permanent, for we both have deposits of worth for the enrichment of each other. Japan and America must ever maintain a permanent friendship for the good of each.

To the south of us lies Mexico, whose civilisation antedates that of the United States. Because we speak different languages it has been more difficult to understand each other. We must frankly admit that our American attitude has not been conducive to international friendship. Economically we have acted the part of a lot of thieves, and have misinterpreted a nation that has been struggling to find itself. I hope the day will hasten when our southern border will be as free from fortifications as is our northern border.

Switzerland is not a strange voice in American councils. Being the earliest republic in Europe, we have locked arms across the Atlantic in seeking fulfillment of our common ideals. Geneva was the home of John Calvin, to whom we acknowledge both our political and religious debt. All American travellers carry forever within their souls pictures of the Switzerland Alps, so that much of Switzerland lives again in America.

Other nations might be tied up as definitely in American interests until we would feel within us the cables of friendship binding us into a perpetual sisterhood of nations, into which no such sacrilege as war should be allowed to intrude. The World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches is seeking to function to that end. If it be asked, is this the sort of world in which the Christian ideals can be made practicable? My answer is that Christianity is the only practical system for a world of this sort. We are here to spend these days in discussing the steps that will make real this practicability, and to that end we cordially welcome to America the representatives whose greetings have brought us the hope of a better world.

APPENDIX

THE WORLD ALLIANCE FOR INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP

I

REPORT OF THE GENERAL SECRETARY

HENRY A. ATKINSON, D.D.

Your General Secretary begs leave to report on the work of the organisation for 1923:

Following the action of the American delegation taken at the World Conference held in Copenhagen in 1922, Dr. Merrill formulated a statement which was unanimously adopted and under its title "An International Program for America" was made the basis of the work of the year 1923.

In this program there are three items, as follows:

(1) CO-OPERATION:

To endorse and cordially approve the informal co-operation which our government is now giving to the humanitarian and other technical organisations which are being efficiently managed by the League of Nations; and to urge upon the President and the Senate the importance of making this informal co-operation formal by the nomination and confirmation of delegates to those organisations which are carrying on the work in which the United States was actively engaged before the world war.

(2) ASSOCIATION:

To urge the government to take immediate steps to bring the United States into real relationship with the other nations of the world either through the

League of Nations or through some other effective form of association.

(3) PARTICIPATION:
To commend cordially the proposed participation of the United States in the Permanent Court of International Justice.
To urge the President to call a conference of the nations to consider, in the spirit of mutual goodwill and human brotherhood, the grave problems which still menace the very fabric of civilisation—such as armaments, economic chaos and other obstacles to the peace of the world.

This program was adopted as a minimum with the feeling that our nation should at least do these things. It was published and commented on very favourably and very widely.

Our first task was to secure its endorsement by as many organisations and groups as possible. Early in the year arrangements were made with the World Peace Foundation in Boston, and the Commission on International Justice and Goodwill of the Federal Council of the Churches for a nation-wide campaign on the basis of this program. Meetings were planned in eighty strategic centers throughout the whole nation. It was proposed that two speakers should present the program at each meeting and that a committee should then be organised for the purpose of organising similar meetings in ten subsidiary centers and each of these ten be committed to the task of organising five others. This we had announced and a method was proposed for promptly getting a group in nearly five thousand centers, large and small, throughout the nation to discuss this program, and take action upon it. No plan is ever carried out completely; however, about sixty of the major meetings were held and

fairly efficient and energetic committees were formed in many places. Meetings in the secondary groups were held and from these, as well as the major meetings, the impetus was carried into local churches, clubs and other organisations. These meetings are still being held, and in ten additional cities of the major groups, we have committees and arrangements perfected for the carrying out of the original plan.

A Hand Book for the use of speakers, teachers and other workers was published and very widely distributed.

After the campaign was well under way a new element entered into the world situation. President Harding and Mr. Hughes evinced a new interest in the question of America associating herself in the humanitarian work of the League of Nations, and a plan was announced whereby America could join the Permanent Court of International Justice at the Hague; therefore, our committee agreed that it would be the part of wisdom to concentrate upon the one item that is now of major importance, that is the question of the United States joining the Court. Other groups were thinking along the same lines and had long been working on the same problems. Notable among these was the National Council for the Prevention of War, with offices in Washington. This organisation has in its executive committee official representatives of many important bodies throughout the nation. Early in the summer it, together with the Federal Council, proposed a special campaign for the Court and as a most appropriate method of emphasising its importance it was proposed that the week preceding Armistice Day should be observed as " World Court Week " by the Churches and other organisations interested in this cause. The Commission on International Justice and Goodwill of the Federal Council of the Churches took

the lead in making it effective through the churches. Through co-operation with this Commission we feel that a very large constituency was reached by our combined efforts.

It is now proposed to continue the campaign. It is our purpose to take a census of the religious leaders of the nation and present another petition to the President and Senate of the United States urging immediate adherence to the Court, similar to those petitions formerly prepared and presented by us on the question of Reduction of Armaments.

It is a huge task we face—but we believe that the best and most thoughtful elements of our nation are with us, and we propose to go forward with the work until we see this International Program for America adopted by our government, and the United States co-operating with all the other nations of the world to put an end to war and its menace for the future.

During the year the American Branch of the Alliance has kept in close touch with the affairs of the other nations through its relationship in the International Committee. There are now vigourous National Councils in the following countries, a total of twenty-seven:

America	Czecho-Slovakia	Switzerland
France	Serb-Croat-Slovene State	Finland
Holland	Portugal	Denmark
Italy	Poland	Greece
Sweden	China	Roumania
Belgium	Great Britain	Bulgaria
Esthonia	Germany	Spain
Lettland	Hungary	Japan
Austria	Norway	Turkey

A conference was held in Zurich, in April, at which representatives of twenty-four nations were present, including delegates from France, Germany, and Belgium. The question of the Ruhr was the principal topic on the Agenda. After four days of hard labour an unanimous report was adopted which urged that the whole question of Reparations, debts and other questions involved in the economic reconstruction of the world, be referred to a world conference to be called by the League of Nations, or if that body could not act then the United States government be asked to issue the call for such a conference. An international committee, headed by Prof. Kohnstamm, of Holland, was set up, with authority to see that this resolution was laid before the officials of the churches and the governments in all the nations of the world. This committee has been at work constantly upon this task. The economic condition of Europe has grown steadily worse throughout the year, until at last the nations have come to realise that something must be done, and done speedily. An economic conference in which all the nations will join is the greatest and most imperative need right now. It is to be hoped that no small consideration nor plea of political expediency on the part of this or any other nation will thwart the plans for such a Conference now under consideration. It would be difficult to exaggerate the evils which curse the world today, or to overstate their dire possibilities for woe in the days to come. America is at least in part to blame. Our halting attitude has contributed much to the confusion and uncertainty, and by reason of the fact that after the war we were the first nation to take counsel of our own selfish interests we set a bad example for the other nations and lost our moral leadership of the world in a time when it was most sadly needed.

Regional Conferences have been held under the guidance of the International Committee in Serbia, Germany, Hungary, Czecho-Slovakia, Poland and Austria. These gatherings have brought together representatives of neighbouring states and have helped to bring about a better relationship. This is notably true in regard to the relations between Roumania, Hungary, Serbia, Austria and Czecho-Slovakia. The International Committee proposes to hold four more such regional Conferences during 1924.

Mr. Gordon, the Associate Secretary, has just returned from Australia. While visiting his home on the other side of the world he formed committees and laid the foundation for a Council in Australia and one in New Zealand.

Dr. Gulick, the Secretary for Oriental relations, has just returned from China, Korea and Japan. He succeeded in forming a Council in China which is a part of the new Federation of Churches of that nation.

One of the newest and most notable achievements of the International Committee is the establishment and operation of an international News Bureau under the direction of Mr. Arthur Porritt, of London. Two Bulletins have been issued so far. The idea is to send out from time to time statements prepared by the councils of the various nations, in which will be given detailed information, facts and figures regarding actual conditions. The value of the first two statements promises a wide usefulness for this service. Porritt furnished in these two Bulletins facts that have found their way into the columns of almost every religious newspaper in the world.

By reason of its close relationship to The Church Peace Union, the American Council has peculiarly close

relationship to the International Committee, and a large influence in shaping its programs and carrying out its plans.

Speaking Tours.

During the year the Alliance has entertained as its guests and has co-operated with The Church Peace Union and the Federal Council of the Churches in entertaining a large number of visitors from other lands. Notable among these visitors were His Grace the Archbishop of Sweden, Dr. Fridtjof Nansen, of Norway; Rev. Thomas Nightingale and Mrs. Nightingale and Rev. T. G. Brierley Kay, of England; the Rev. Jules Jezequel and Mrs. Jezequel, of France. Nine complete itineraries have been made out in this office. As a matter of interesting statistics we have arranged, this year, for tours for our visitors from abroad and our own American speakers covering more than fifty thousand miles of travel. Scores of meetings have been held in which we had the major responsibility, and at hundreds of other meetings we have furnished the principal speakers.

Minorities.

Through the Committee on the Rights of Religious Minorities we have made several pronouncements on conditions in countries where these questions are of vital importance.

As the result of a visit to Transylvania of the Unitarian Commission in the summer of 1922 a book was published on the right of minorities under the Roumanian rule. We have helped to circulate this book, and through our committee called it to the attention of the Roumanian authorities.

In June your Secretary attended a meeting that was held in Vienna, called by the Association of League of Nations Unions, where this question of Minorities was discussed. He, together with Mr. R. J. Caldwell, served on several important committees and helped to establish plans looking toward the development of a wider freedom for the minority groups and better relations with the new authorities under which they are forced to live.

It is now proposed to send a new Commission into Transylvania in the summer of 1924. This Commission will be composed of representatives of the four minority groups—the Reformed Churches, the Unitarians, the Roman Catholics and the Jews. The Committee on Minorities, which is an integral part of the work of the Church Peace Union, has been formally recognised by the Association of League of Nations Unions as the American representative on this question of Minorities.

Publications.

We have issued a number of leaflets and pamphlets and have arranged for the publication in hundreds of magazines and papers sermons, speeches and special articles, all dealing with the various angles of the common problems of world peace and friendship among the nations. Dr. Lynch has given fully his time and attention to this department of our work, and in his report gives details regarding his work and tells especially of the News Letter and Information Service which has now reached such proportions as to command a growing share of attention. It has been the endeavour of the organisation to keep down the cost of printing, and before we agree to publish any pamphlet we try to ascertain four things: *first* that it is really needed, *second* that we have a method for distributing it, *third* that it is as brief and

pointed as it can be made, and *fourth* that it is written in such a style and printed in such a form that it will be read. If pamphlets could bring peace the tons of such publications written and published on this question through the centuries would long ago have finished the job.

Secretarial Activity.

The Secretary has attempted to meet all the demands that have been made upon him. The work in Europe has developed to such an extent that it is necessary to spend a great deal of time with the various groups that are looking to us for leadership.

There is an increasing demand for field service. I have responded as far as possible, making one trip across the country, and inside of three weeks, in company with Mr. Hamilton Holt, giving thirty-six addresses.

The question with everyone these days is, what things are most worth doing. All of us face that problem, and it has seemed to your Secretary that with the heavy executive demands which the organisation and its work put upon him, it is better to lay the major emphasis here rather than to attempt any continuous service as a public speaker. However, as far as strength and time permit, it has been a pleasure to have this wider contact with the field. Especially, it is valuable whenever an opportunity is given, to speak before University and College groups.

Co-operation.

We have co-operative relationships with many and varied groups doing similar work. A summary of the various requests and the different organisations making

them for any one week in the year reveals the widespread and growing influence of the organisation.

Plans for 1924.

We propose to continue in 1924 the work we have been doing through the current year. Our particular efforts for the time being are directed to the effort to induce the United States to join the Permanent Court of International Justice. This is the most important matter that is now before us.

We are committed to the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, which is to be held in Stockholm in 1925.

During the next year there will be a series of Regional Conferences held at various points in Europe for which America will have to provide the funds.

As far as can now be seen, for the next three years the Secretary of this organisation will have to divide his time, as he has in the past, between Europe and America. With the arrangements now established this can be done, and by assigning to the Federal Council Commission on International Justice and Goodwill certain definite tasks in the work with the churches in America, the work of this organisation, and the Federal Council itself, can be made stronger and more efficient than ever before.

REPORT OF THE EDUCATIONAL SECRETARY

FREDERICK LYNCH, D.D.

My work in general falls under three heads:

1. CORRESPONDENCE: This is very important. We have built up a very large constituency, especially of clergymen, who look to us for guidance in their preaching on

international themes, and for information. This correspondence has reached such dimensions that it is very difficult to handle, but it opens up one of the best opportunities of service that our Alliance has. Almost every one of these correspondents becomes an agent for our work—another educational secretary!

2. EDITORIAL: There is, first of all, the bi-weekly news letter. This letter has had a very cordial reception. Not only do the ministers use it in their work, and not only does it afford an opportunity which one could not avail himself of through private correspondence to ask co-operation, but the religious press copies it widely. The aim of this news letter is not propaganda primarily, but to keep our constituency informed of the latest movements looking toward international goodwill and to interpret them from the Christian point of view as far as possible.

3. PREACHING AND SPEAKING: Every Sunday I have the pleasure of occupying the pulpit of some church. The churches of every Protestant communion freely open their pulpits. I could preach twenty times every Sunday could I accept. Dr. Atkinson and Dr. Boynton and others help to extend this influence through the pulpit. During each week I have spoken on an average of three times. Some of these addresses have been made before men's clubs and women's organisations, but oftener before Ministers' Associations and State and National Conferences, as affording larger opportunities. The meeting with clergymen is the most effective because they admit of questions and discussions. I have made several tours of which one, through the Middle West, is an instance. I started at Kansas City and went north through Topeka, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Omaha, Sioux Falls, and other cities, ending in Duluth. In these tours I spoke three

times a day. In three churches on Sundays, where union services were often arranged; during the week at Conferences, Colleges, Luncheon Clubs and mass meetings. These audiences were greatly extended by extensive newspaper reporting and broadcasting apparatus (I would like to say here that always the most successful meetings were in those places where there was a strong local federation or council of churches with a wide-awake and efficient secretary).

This correspondence, and especially these visitations to the churches, have afforded me a fairly good opportunity to sense the attitude of the churches on the matter of the participation of the United States in world affairs. The conclusions I have reached are these:

1. There is practically no sympathy in the churches with the attitude of Senator Johnson and others that the United States should live an isolated life and have nothing to do with Europe. The churches are too Christian to share that view. With them "brotherhood does not stop at the shores of the two oceans." The feeling is universal that the United States belongs to the family of nations and should take active part in helping to solve the problems harassing the world, and should help to lift Europe out of the chaos and slough of despond into which she has fallen. It is the question of method that perplexes the churches. Two methods are now before them—whether Mr. Bok will produce a third remains to be seen—and toward these two the attitude is as follows:

(a) Toward our country's participation in the WORLD COURT practical unanimity, but not great enthusiasm, because the Court is not broad enough in its scope and power. There would have been more zeal manifested had it been made obligatory upon every participating nation to take *all* of its disputes before the Court of settlement.

Then there would have been something definite and decisive. With voluntary use of the Court, while the people feel that it is a great step toward international co-operation and world peace, and, while they will support it, they feel at the same time that it falls far short of an effective tribunal.

(b) Toward the LEAGUE OF NATIONS there has been some change of attitude. When Mr. Wilson came home from Europe eighty per cent. of the Protestant pastors of the country were in favour of our entrance into it, and I think one can safely say seventy per cent of the laymen of the churches. Then came the unfortunate *debâcle* of the League issue taken into politics. Two things immediately happened to dampen the ardour for the League. First, several of the Republican leaders were opposed to it and had weight with their constituency. There are still a large number of good Christians left who cannot let their religion interfere with their party allegiance. Secondly, thousands were misled by asseverations of the Republican party conveyed through campaign addresses and by the famous letter of the Thirty-One that the Republican administration would get us into the League or give us something better. After the overwhelming victory of the party it was hard to tell what to do about the League. The people waited, many forgetting. But there are signs that they are getting tired of waiting, and one can see signs of reviving interest. The visits of such men as Lord Robert Cecil, Lloyd George, the Archbishop of Upsala and Dr. Nansen have greatly helped to revive this interest, but the chiefest cause is fourfold. (1) Nothing has happened and the United States has stood aside and watched affairs—which we helped to create—go from bad to worse. (2) The situation in Europe with its chaos, poverty, despair,

strife, injustice and the threatened collapse of civilisation itself. (3) A reviving feeling that the United States is forgetting its sense of mission, and with this an uncomfortable feeling, if not one of shame, and (4) the knowledge of what the League is accomplishing for humanity, and we not there.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY, COMMISSION ON ORIENTAL RELATIONS

SIDNEY L. GULICK, D.D.

During the past year I have had the great privilege of carrying to the churches of the Far East a message of greeting and goodwill from the Federal Council and the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches. The original plan was that Dr. John Finley and myself should form a mission of two for this purpose, but special exigencies arose which prevented Dr. Finley from carrying out his part of the program. The delay of his arrival made it possible for me to prolong my first visit in China so that I was able to visit all the important cities from Peking in the north down to Canton in the south through eastern and central China.

During the autumn union committees were set up, both in China and Japan, under whose auspices the meetings for this mission were arranged. My official visit in Japan lasted from February 1st to the end of March, with three weeks at the end of May. Two weeks were spent in Korea and an added month in China from the middle of April.

During these eight months in the Far East I had rather unusual opportunity of meeting not only missionaries and native pastors but important leaders in business and in

the Government. There resulted from this extended experience in the Far East a number of very definite impressions, a few of which it may be worth while at this time to emphasise.

1. The throbbing new life in the Far East was exceedingly impressive. The impact of Occidental civilisation on the Oriental peoples has started millions of their young men and women along lines of life and thought quite new to the established customs and ideas of their ancient civilisations. Perhaps there is no more important manifestation of this new life than the demand for modern Occidental education. In all the countries of the Far East the school systems are wholly inadequate to meet these demands, particularly in regard to secondary and higher education.

In Oita, Japan, for instance, at one of the banquets I sat beside the Principal of the Commercial College. In the course of our conversation I learned that examinations for the new class were then under way. I was told that although the number of possible admittances was 120 the applicants who were taking examinations approximated 2,000. Somewhat later I learned that over 750 who had successfully passed examinations for entrance to Doshisha, our Christian University in Kyoto, had been rejected on account of lack of room. Similar conditions, though not so extreme, exist in Korea, China and the Philippines.

Other manifestations of this new life are found in the rapid invasion of the Orient by Occidental industry with its mass production and congestion of population in large cities. The evils of Occidental industrialism are showing themselves in distressing form, particularly in China.

2. I was deeply impressed with the splendid character of the men and women whom I met in this long journey.

I refer not only to the missionaries, but to the native pastors and to the official leaders in the Governments. Large numbers of these men have received Occidental education, and not a few of them are professing Christians, devoting their lives and applying their knowledge and their moral character to the solution of their pressing problems. I returned from the Far East with increased confidence in the intrinsic capacity of those peoples to solve their own problems. Afresh I felt the crassness and stupidity of the proposition that Occidentals are inherently a superior race to Orientals.

3. The attitudes of appreciation and goodwill toward America manifested in all the Far Eastern countries was most impressive. The Washington Conference on Limitation of Armament has accomplished much in removing doubts and suspicions and in convincing, particularly the Japanese, that America has no selfish aggressive purposes of conquest and domination in the Pacific.

That Washington Conference rolled away what were felt in Japan to be ominous clouds of storm and possibly of disaster.

4. I was impressed afresh with the unparalleled opportunity which America and Americans have in the Far East in asserting those influences of goodwill and friendship so necessary in the maintenance of peace and in the promotion of genuine prosperity in those lands.

5. Perhaps the deepest impression made upon me was that of an extraordinary modern miracle in the making; namely, the reconciliation of great races. Every Sunday I attended church services, even when I was not called upon for addresses. There I saw Christian leaders, Chinese, Korean, Japanese, carrying forward the responsibility of their church services in forms and with a spirit that commanded my deepest admiration. In those

strange tongues they were reading the same Bible that we read, offering prayer to the same Heavenly Father and singing the same great hymns of the Faith. In China and Korea I could not understand the words, but the spirit was altogether plain, especially when they sang hymns using the same tunes that we use, such as "My Faith Looks up to Thee," "What a Friend We Have in Jesus!" "Rock of Ages, Cleft for Me," "How Firm a Foundation!"

Moreover it was evident from the relations manifest between missionaries and native Christians that there were deep bonds of fellowship and friendship. Those Chinese, Korean, and Japanese pastors and missionaries from the West really know and understand, trust and love each other. They have confidence in one another and flowing out from that relationship it is not too much to say that many millions of Orientals really believe that there are good and trustworthy white men. This could not have been said a century ago, or even fifty years ago.

And through the influence of missionaries on their home lands public opinion toward Chinese, Koreans and Japanese has been modified in a very fundamental way. Millions of Occidentals have come to believe that there are good and trustworthy and honourable Orientals; the chasm between the East and the West is not impassable; the bridge of brotherhood and goodwill is growing broader and stronger every year.

This is a wonderful achievement, a miracle, the most tremendous miracle of the ages. In it lies the hope of the world, for only through a most fundamental reconciliation of the great races of the East and the West is there hope of the ultimate peace of the world.

6. Finally, as I returned to America, I felt the urgent necessity of pressing forward our Christian activities in

the promotion of missionary work in the Far East, in the removal of misunderstandings and parochial arrogance and race pride in our land, and the creation of true Christian internationalism.

For a century the churches have been moving forward steadily to larger and deeper appreciation of the meaning of Christ's command to "preach the gospel to every creature." On the whole our churches now recognise that no church is fulfilling its duty that has no share in the great evangelistic program at home and abroad.

But we begin to see that in preaching this gospel we are under urgent obligations to create the right conditions for its hearing. The missionary who goes with the Bible and the soldier who goes with the sword are contradictions. The missionary work cannot go forward to any large success so long as Occidental nations regard economic imperialism backed by military power as legitimate. We begin to see that a Christian civilisation must banish selfish and aggressive use of force. Our international relations must be based on Christian principles of brotherhood and service. We also begin to see that no church is doing its full part in spreading the gospel that does not instruct its church members in the principles of Christian internationalism and equip them for doing their part as Christian citizens in making effective Christian ideals in regard to the relations and policies of our nation as we face other nations.

The great task immediately ahead of our churches, if they are to render their full service for the upbuilding of the Kingdom of God, requires an enlargement of vision of Christian duty and opportunity for the enthronement of Christ in the international life of the world.

REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP THROUGH THE CHURCHES

CAPT. E. W. SCOTT,

Official Representative from the Navy Department.

The invitation to attend the sessions of the American Council of the World Alliance for International Fellowship through the Churches was a personal one. While I would have been glad to attend in any capacity, I felt that my presence here would have some real significance if it had the official sanction of the Navy Department. The matter was therefore referred to my immediate superior, the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, for his approval, with the result that I am here under official orders from the Department. I have not been advised as to what I shall say, but was told, if opportunity came to appear before you, that I should speak as my own judgment dictated. What I shall say, therefore, is said of my own responsibility, but I believe it would receive official endorsement.

You, the World Alliance for International Fellowship through the Churches, are launched out on a sane and sensible course. You take conditions as you find them; you acknowledge the differences, the national, the lingual, and racial antagonisms, and the selfishness that exists among nations. You do not ignore these obstacles, but you seek to surmount or remove them. To its task of evangelising the individual and a second task of improving and ennobling society, the Church has added a third task still grander in conception, that of removing suspicion, distrust and jealousies which are the causes of war, and substituting therefor international friendship, mutual understanding and fellowship, which are the foun-

dations of peace. Here is a vision that is not visionary, a plan that is practical, a program that will require time and united effort on the part of the best men and women of every nation, but is being built on sure and substantial foundations. No man who has a spark of human sympathy can honestly present the least criticism of such a program. He ought to work for it with all his heart and soul. And to lead in the accomplishment of this grand and glorious purpose we feel that there is no better agent than the Church Universal, for certainly her motives cannot be seriously questioned.

We feel that there is nothing incongruous in the presence here of a representative of the Navy Department. It is true that the Navy constitutes our first line of defense, that we have for our prime function to prepare for war, and that we are definitely charged with and responsible for our National defense in any emergency that may arise and which our statesmen cannot ward off or avoid. Nevertheless, we conceive it to be our common task to carry the spirit of goodwill, as your semi-official ambassadors, to the peoples of the countries we visit, and to protect the defenseless, relieve distress and suffering, preserve the peace, and make the world a better place for men to live in.

We are not militarists and never can be, for we are bone of your bone and flesh of your flesh. We desire peace and know too well the waste, the horrors and the folly of war, and therefore we wish you every success in your most laudable program for the peace of the world. We believe it is necessary for us to hold the fort, if I may use that term, for the time being, as the servants of and responsible to your government, for there are forces abroad, the world over, that recognise force alone. Yet, we think it is not inconsistent, but most

response to the call of a group of Swiss pastors. This conference continued its sessions in London. Ninety delegates were present from several nations, and they were unanimous in their agreement that, " inasmuch as all sections of the Church of Christ are equally concerned in the maintenance of peace and the promotion of good feeling among the races of the world, it is advisable for them to act in concert in their efforts to bring it about."

IV

Scope:

As its name signifies, it is a World Organisation. It is engaged in the enterprise of establishing National Councils in every country. Plans have been formed for its future growth and activities with the ultimate object of being able to mobilise goodwill for the effective working out of international relationships.

V

Education:

A bi-weekly News Letter is issued. This letter has had a very cordial reception. Ministers use it in their work and the religious press copies it widely. Its aim is not propaganda primarily, but is to keep our constituency informed of the latest movements looking toward international goodwill, and to interpret them from the Christian point of view. Bulletins and pamphlets informative in their nature, setting forth the development of the work, are also published by the American Branch.

Dr. Lynch, the editor of the News Letter, is Secretary of the Educational Department. He has been called repeatedly to Europe during the last few years, and while there engaged in preaching tours of England and held

important conferences with political and religious leaders of other nations.

VI

Information Service:

This is very important. A large constituency, especially of clergymen, students of high schools, colleges and universities look to this service for guidance on international themes. This service affords one of the best opportunities the Alliance has.

VII

Interchange:

An exchange of preachers and speakers between Europe and the United States has been carried on for some years. This plan will be more fully developed in the future. It holds great possibilities for the fostering of international friendship.

Arrangements are made for the visitors to appear in influential pulpits, men's clubs, women's organisations, minister's associations, colleges, universities and other important groups.

VIII

Conferences:

We have established in 500 American communities Local Committees on Co-operation with the World Alliance. Each Local Committee sets itself to foster the organisation of study groups, and urges the use of some constructive course of study or discussion outline each year.

The Local Committee functions as the special group in each community charged with the responsibility of

educating the community in all matters pertaining to better international relationships and a better world order. To this end it seeks to provide at least one course of lectures open to the public and a series of sermons in the different churches, to improve inter-racial relationships in American communities. Where possible it publishes bulletins, and in other ways seeks to make the ideals of the World Alliance vital and effective in the local community.

IX

Administration:

The World Alliance works in close co-operation with The Church Peace Union and the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, in this way economising and conserving its work and doing away with the necessity for setting up new machinery.

X

Membership:

There are seven types of membership recognised by the World Alliance determined by the amount contributed each year to the work of the Alliance:

1. Regular membership	.....	$ 2.00	per year
2. Sustaining "	.....	5.00	" "
3. Contributing "	.....	10.00	" "
4. Subscribing "	.....	25.00	" "
5. Honorary "	.....	50.00	" "
6. Life "	.....	100.00	" "
7. Patron "	.....	500.00	" "

All members in the National Organisation are members of the American Council, and all members will receive

from the national office all the literature, books, bulletins and other publications without extra cost. Membership also gives a vote in the meetings of the National Alliance and admission to all sessions with the exception of the meetings of the Executive Committee. Membership in the National Organisation gives representation in the World Organisation.

XI

Specific Objects for America:

To stimulate discussion with a view to intelligent judgment on problems of world justice, world friendship, and international co-operation.

To foster just and friendly relations between our country and all other nations, especially China and Japan, also Mexico and the other nations in the Western Hemisphere, and to defeat the attempt now being made to stir up enmity and discord between the white and yellow races.

To foster right relations between the foreign born and native groups in America.

To enlist and organise the churches and Christians of America for concerted action in matters of international righteousness and goodwill through the medium of our Local Committees on Co-operation with the World Alliance.

WORLD ORGANISATION

THE WORLD ALLIANCE FOR INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP THROUGH THE CHURCHES

President:

THE MOST REVEREND THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

Vice-Presidents:

THE RT. REV. THE ARCHBISHOP OF UPSALA (Sweden).
THE RT. REV. CHRYSOSTOME, THE METROPOLITAN OF ATHENS (Greece).
ARCHBISHOP AND METROPOLITAN ILARION RADONIC, BISHOP OF TUZLA (Serb-Croat-Slovene State).
THE MOST HOLY METROPOLITAN OF CAESAREA, NIKOLAOS (Turkey).
RT. REV. STEFANE GHEORGHIOFF, METROPOLITAN OF SOFIA (Bulgaria).
HIS GRACE THE METROPOLITAN, MIRON CHRISTA (Roumania).
THE REV. WILLIAM P. MERRILL, D.D. (America).
THE REV. PASTEUR WILFRED MONOD (France).
PROFESSOR DAVID S. CAIRNS, D.D. (Britain).
THE RT. REV. BISHOP ALEXANDER RAFFAY (Hungary).
DEKAN OTTO HEROLD (Switzerland).
HIS EXCELLENCY DR. J. TH. DE VISSER (Holland).
PRESIDENT D. FRIEDRICH A. SPIECKER (Germany).
DR. GEORGE JANOSKA (Czecho-Slovakia).

Joint Honorary Secretaries:

RT. HON. SIR WILLOUGHBY H. DICKINSON, K.B.E., London.
REV. FREDERICK LYNCH, D.D., New York.
M. JACQUES DUMAS, Paris.
PASTOR DR. F. SIEGMUND-SCHULTZE, Berlin.
REV. DR. KNUT B. WESTMAN, Upsala.
PROFESSOR EUGENE CHOISY, Geneva.

Honorary Treasurer:

M. GUILLAUME FATIO, Geneva.

Organization Secretary for Europe:

REV. ALEXANDER RAMSAY, D.D.

MEMBERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE

Chairman: Rev. Nehemiah Boynton, D.D.

United States of America

Rev. Henry A. Atkinson, D.D.
Rev. Peter Ainslie, D.D.
Rev. Nehemiah Boynton, D.D.
Rev. Arthur J. Brown, D.D.
Pres. W. H. P. Faunce, D.D.
Hamilton Holt.
Rev. Charles E. Jefferson, D.D.
Rev. Frederick Lynch, D.D.
Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, D.D.
Rev. William P. Merrill, D.D.
John R. Mott, LL.D.
George A. Plimpton, LL.D.
Bishop Luther B. Wilson, D.D.

Austria

Hofrat Professor Dr. theol. Dr. phil. Karl Beth.
Prof. Johannes F. Haberl.
Senior Pfarrer Dr. theol. Erich Stokl.

Belgium

Pasteur Henri Anet.
Pasteur A. Gautier.
Pasteur W. Hoek.
Pasteur P. Rochedieu.

Britain

Mrs. Creighton.
Rt. Hon. Sir W. H. Dickinson, K.B.E.
Rev. W. H. Drummond.
Lady Parmoor.
Rev. J. H. Rushbrooke, M.A., D.D.
Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of Winchester.
Very Rev. the Dean of Worcester.

Bulgaria

Pastor D. N. Furnajieff.
Rt. Rev. Bishop Dr. Stefane P. Gheorghieff.
Mr. Dimitre Misheff.
Rev. Protopresbyter Dr. Stefane Tzankoff.

China

Prof. R. C. Chao.
Mr. S. T. Wen.
Rev. Dr. T. T. Lew.
Rev. Bishop J. L. Birney.
Miss S. C. Ting.
Rev. Dr. J. L. Stuart.
Rev. E. J. Bentley.
Dr. Chang Po-ling.
Miss Tseng Pao-suen.
Mr. F. S. Brockmen.
Miss C. J. Lambert.
Mr. T. Z. Koo.
Rt. Rev. H. J. Molony.

Czecho-Slovakia

Dr. J. Prochazka.
Rev. Fedor Ruppeldt.
Rev. Dr. Wehrenfennig.
Prof. Dr. Francis Zilka.

Denmark

Rt. Rev. Valdemar Ammundsen, D.D.
Rev. Hans Dreioe.
Rev. Chr. Norlev.
Rt. Rev. Bishop H. Ostenfeld.

Esthonia

Rector Prof. Dr. Heinrich Koppel.
Bischof Jakob Kukk.
Assessor Pastor Jaan Lattik, M.P.
Docent Eduard Tennmann.

Finland

Bishop Jaakko Gummerus, D.D.
Professor Arthur Hjelt, D.D.
Rev. Aleksi Lehtonen, B.D.
Pastor Edvin Viren.

France

M. Jacques Dumas.
M. J. Faivret.
M. le Professeur Charles Gide.
M. le Pasteur Elie Gounelle.
M. le Pasteur Jules Jezequel.
Madame J. Jezequel.
M. le Pasteur G. Lauga.
M. le Pasteur Wilfred Monod.

Germany

Oberkonsistorialpraesident a. D. Dr. Curtius.
Geh. Konsistorialrat Professor D. Dr. Deissmann.

Prediger Theophil Mann.
Professor D. Richter.
Missionsdirektor D. Schreiber.
Pastor D. Dr. Siegmund-Schultze.
Professor D. Friedrich Albert Spiecker.

Greece

Professor Hamilcar Alivisatos, D.D.
Professor Dem. Balanos, D.D.
Professor Constantine Dyobonniotes, D.D.
Professor Gregory Papamichael, D.D.

Holland

Prof. J. A. Cramer, D.D.
Rev. P. Eldering.
Prof. Dr. Ph. Kohnstamm.
Prof. Dr. J. W. Pont.

Hungary

Professor Dr. G. Antal.
Professor Alexis de Boer.
Mr. John Pelenyi.

Italy

Professore R. Falchi.
Signor Avocato Cav. Carlo M. Ferreri.
Professore Roberto Prochet.
Rev. Dr. D. G. Whittinghill.

Japan

Rev. Dr. Y. Chiba.
Rev. Dr. S. Motoda.
Rev. T. Tsuga.
Rev. Dr. K. Tsunashima.

Lettland

Mr. A. Dahwid.
Propst K. Irbe.
Pastor W. Maldons.
Mr. Alexander von Tobien.

Norway

Archdeacon Carsten Hansteen.
Rev. Fredrik Klaveness.
Rt. Rev. Bishop Bernt Stoylen.
Rev. N. B. Thvedt.

Poland

Generalsuperintendent D. Blau.
Generalsuperintendent Julius Bursche.
Dr. Jacques Glass.
Pfarrer Dr. Fritz Seefeldt.

Portugal

Bishop Joaquim dos Santos Figueiredo.
Mr. Frederico W. Flower.
Mr. Robert Moreton.
Rev. Prof. Alfredo H. da Silva.

Roumania

His Grace the Metropolitain Miron Christa.
Professor Dragomir Demetrescu.
Pfarrer R. Honigberger.
Pfarrer Moor.

Serb-Croat-Slovene State

The Metropolitain Archbishop Ilarion Radonic.
Prof. Dr. Voyslav Janitch, M.P.
Pfarrer Paul Korbai.
Senior Samuel Schumacher, M.P.

Spain

Rev. Francisco Albricias. Rev. William B. Douglas.
Rev. Fernando Cabrera. Rev. Enrique Lindegaard.

Sweden

Rev. J. Bystrom.
Dr. Karl Fries.
Professor Dr. Sir Otto Nordenskjold.
Major Anders Sjostedt.

Switzerland

Prof. Dr. Paul Bohringer. Dekan Dr. O. Herold.
Prof. Dr. J. Eugene Choisy. Pfarrer Jakob Keller.

Turkey

Professor Emmanuel.
The Most Holy the Metropolitan of Cæsarea, Nikolaos.
His Eminence Mr. Alexander Zotos.

OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF THE WORLD ALLIANCE FOR INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP THROUGH THE CHURCHES

Executive Offices: 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Officers.

William P. Merrill, *Chairman.*
Henry A. Atkinson, *General Secretary.*

FREDERICK LYNCH, *Educational Secretary.*
LINLEY V. GORDON, *Associate Secretary.*
GEORGE A. PLIMPTON, *Treasurer.*

Executive Committee.
Officers, Members Ex-Officio.
Rev. Peter Ainslie, D.D.
Mrs. John Allen.
Rev. Russell Bowie, D.D.
Rev. Nehemiah Boynton, D.D.
Rev. Arthur J. Brown, D.D.
Prof. William Adams Brown, D.D.
Rev. Samuel A. Eliot, D.D.
Hamilton Holt, LL.D.
Miss Sarah Lyon.
Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, D.D.
Rev. John A. Morehead, D.D.
Mrs. Edgerton Parsons.
Mr. Fred B. Smith.
Mr. Fennell P. Turner.
Bishop Luther B. Wilson, D.D.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF THE WORLD ALLIANCE

MISS JANE ADDAMS — Chicago, Ill.
Founder of Hull House. Writer and lecturer on social and political reform.

REV. WILL W. ALEXANDER — Atlanta, Ga.
Director, Commission on Inter-racial Co-operation.

MR. WILLIAM C. ALLEN — San Jose, Cal.
Member, Society of Friends, Author-Traveller.

REV. ALFRED WILLIAMS ANTHONY, D.D. — Hartsdale, N. Y.
Formerly Executive Secretary, Home Missions Council.

REV. G. G. ATKINS, D.D. — Detroit, Mich.
Pastor, First Congregational Church.

MRS. LEMUEL C. BARNES — New York, N. Y.
Organiser, Neighbours' League of America.

REV. JAMES L. BARTON, D.D. — Boston, Mass.
Secretary, American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. Chairman, Near East Relief.

REV. SAMUEL ZANE BATTEN, D.D. Philadelphia, Pa.
Chairman, Social Service Commission, Northern Baptist Convention.

CAPTAIN EDWARD L. BEACH Palo Alto, California
Formerly Commandant, Mare Island Navy Yard, Lecturer, Leland Stanford University.

BISHOP WILLIAM M. BELL Harrisburg, Pa.
Church of the United Brethren in Christ, Lecturer, Author.

MR. JAMES BERTRAM New York, N. Y.
Secretary, Carnegie Corporation.

MR. NOLAN R. BEST New York, N. Y.
Editor of The Continent.

RT. REV. CHARLES H. BRENT, D.D. Buffalo, N. Y.
Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Western New York.

MR. FLETCHER BROCKMAN New York, N. Y.
International Committee of Young Men's Christian Association.

REV. CHARLES R. BROWN, D.D. New Haven, Conn.
Dean, Yale School of Divinity.

REV. F. W. BURNHAM, D.D. St. Louis, Mo.
Secretary, Foreign Missions Board, Disciples of Christ.

DR. KENYON L. BUTTERFIELD Amherst, Mass.
President, Massachusetts Agricultural College.

BISHOP JAMES CANNON, JR., D.D. Washington, D. C.
Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

MRS. ANDREW CARNEGIE New York, N. Y.

REV. CHARLES F. CARTER, D.D. Hartford, Conn.
Pastor, Congregational Church.

REV. RAYMOND CALKINS, D.D. Cambridge, Mass.
Pastor, Congregational Church.

REV. FRANCIS E. CLARK, D.D. Boston, Mass.
President, Christian Endeavour Society.

REV. HENRY SLOANE COFFIN, D.D. New York, N. Y.
Pastor, Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church.

Mr. George W. Coleman — Boston, Mass.
President, Babson Institute, Wellesley Hills, Mass. Director, Ford Hall Forum.

Miss Mabel Cratty — New York, N. Y.
Executive Secretary, Home Department, Young Women's Christian Associations.

Rev. Edward Cummings — Boston, Mass.
Executive Secretary, World Peace Foundation.

Rev. William Horace Day, D.D. — Bridgeport, Conn.
Pastor, United Church.

Mr. Sherwood Eddy — New York, N. Y.
Associate Secretary, International Committee, Young Men's Christian Association.

Rev. Frederick L. Fagley, D.D. — New York, N. Y.
Associate Secretary, National Council of Congregational Churches.

President W. H. P. Faunce, D.D. — Providence, R. I.
President, Brown University.

Professor Irving Fisher — New Haven, Conn.
Professor, Political Economy, Yale University.

Rev. Harry Emerson Fosdick, D.D. — New York, N. Y.
Professor, Union Theological Seminary. Preacher, First Presbyterian Church.

Mr. Raymond B. Fosdick — New York, N. Y.
Attorney-at-Law. Formerly Under-Secretary, League of Nations. Trustee, Rockefeller Foundation.

Mr. Robert H. Gardiner — Gardiner, Me.
Secretary, World Conference on Faith and Order.

Rev. Howard B. Grose, D.D. — Mt. Vernon, N. Y.
Baptist clergyman. Editor of "Missions." Author.

Rev. Roy B. Guild, D.D. — New York, N. Y.
Secretary, Commission on Church Councils, Associate Secretary of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

Rev. Sidney L. Gulick, D.D. — New York, N. Y.
Associate Secretary, The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

MRS. IDA W. HARRISON — Lexington, Ky.
Vice-President, Christian Women's Board of Missions. Disciples of Christ. Author.

PROF. ALLEN D. HOLE — Richmond, Ind.
Professor at Earlham College. Chairman, The Five Years Meeting of Friends in America.

REV. IVAN LEE HOLT — St. Louis, Mo.
Pastor, St. John's Church, M. E. South.

REV. LYNN H. HOUGH, D.D. — Detroit, Mich.
Pastor, Central M. E. Church.

PROF. MANLEY O. HUDSON — Cambridge, Mass.
Professor, Harvard University Law School.

BISHOP EDWIN H. HUGHES, D.D. — Boston, Mass.
Bishop, Methodist Episcopal Church.

PROF. WILLIAM I. HULL — Swarthmore, Pa.
Professor, Swarthmore College.

MR. A. A. HYDE — Wichita, Kans.
Manufacturer and business man.

REV. FINIS S. IDLEMAN — New York, N. Y.
Pastor, Central Church of Disciples of Christ.

MR. WILL IRWIN — New York, N. Y.
Author, novelist and war correspondent.

REV. CHARLES E. JEFFERSON, D.D. — New York, N. Y.
Pastor, Broadway Tabernacle.

PRESIDENT FRANK E. JENKINS, D.D. — Demorest, Ga.
President, Piedmont College.

COL. WALTER P. JENKINS — New York, N. Y.
National Secretary, Salvation Army.

REV. HOWARD AGNEW JOHNSTON, D.D. — Chicago, Ill.
President, Chicago Church Federation.

DR. DAVID STARR JORDAN — Palo Alto, Calif.
Formerly President of Leland Stanford University.

MR. JAMES R. JOY — New York, N. Y.
Editor, "The Christian Advocate."

MR. ORRIN R. JUDD — New York, N. Y.
Officer of the Columbia Trust Company.

PRESIDENT HENRY CHURCHILL KING — Oberlin, Ohio
President, Oberlin College.

REV. F. H. KNUBEL, D.D. — New York, N. Y.
President, United Lutheran Church in America.

MRS. JAMES LEES LAIDLAW — New York, N. Y.
Vice-President, Women's Pro-League Council. Chairman, Welfare Committee New York League of Women Voters.

REV. JOHN H. LATHROP — Brooklyn, N. Y.
Pastor, Church of the Saviour. (Unitarian)

REV. CURTIS LEE LAWS, D.D. — New York, N. Y.
Editor, "The Watchman-Examiner."

REV. ALBERT G. LAWSON, D.D. — New York, N. Y.
Baptist clergyman.

REV. RIVINGTON D. LORD, D.D. — New York, N. Y.
Baptist clergyman. Recording Secretary, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

PRESIDENT A. LAWRENCE LOWELL — Cambridge, Mass.
President, Harvard University.

BISHOP FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL, D.D. — Pittsburgh, Pa.
Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

REV. JOHN MCDOWELL, D.D. — New York, N. Y.
Secretary, Board of Home Missions of Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

PRESIDENT HENRY NOBLE MACCRACKEN, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
President, Vassar College.

PRES. W. DOUGLAS MACKENZIE, D.D. — Hartford, Conn.
President, Hartford Theological Seminary.

MRS. EDWIN D. MEAD — Brookline, Mass.
Author. National Secretary, Women's Peace Party.

HON. CARL E. MILLIKEN — Augusta, Me.
Formerly Governor of Maine.

BISHOP JOHN M. MOORE — Nashville, Tenn.
Bishop, Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

REV. C. C. MORRISON — Chicago, Ill.
Editor, "The Christian Century."

MRS. JAMES W. MORRISSON — Chicago, Ill.
Member, Board of Directors, Chicago Federation of Churches.

PRES. EDGAR Y. MULLINS — Louisville, Ky.
President, Louisville Theological Seminary.

REV. FRANK MASON NORTH, D.D. — New York, N. Y.
Secretary, Board of Foreign Missions, Methodist Episcopal Church.

MRS. EDGERTON PARSONS — New York, N. Y.
New York State President, American Association of University Women. Secretary, New York State League of Women Voters.

PROF. FRANCIS G. PEABODY — Cambridge, Mass.
Theologian, author and educator.

REV. ROCKWELL H. POTTER, D.D. — Hartford, Conn.
Pastor, Congregational Church. Moderator National Council of Congregational Churches.

PROF. HARRIS FRANKLIN RALL, D.D. — Evanston, Ill.
Professor, Garrett Theological Seminary.

REV. JUNIUS B. REMENSNYDER, D.D. — New York, N. Y.
Pastor, St. James Lutheran Church.

MR. RAYMOND ROBINS — Chicago, Ill.
Lecturer, author and social economist.

JUDGE HENRY WADE ROGERS — New York, N. Y.
Judge, United States Court.

REV. E. TALLMADGE ROOT, D.D. — Boston, Mass.
Secretary, Massachusetts State Federation of Churches.

REV. CHARLES M. SHELDON, D.D. — Topeka, Kans.
Clergyman and author.

MRS. ROBERT E. SPEER — New York, N. Y.
President, International Committee Y. W. C. A.

MRS. H. R. STEELE — Nashville, Tenn.
Women's Missionary Board. (M. E. South)

HON. WILLIAM E. SWEET — Denver, Colo.
Governor of the State of Colorado.

PROF. W. J. SWIGART — Huntingdon, Pa.
Professor, Juniata College.

REV. E. GUY TALBOT — Pasadena, Calif.
Secretary, California State Federation of Churches.

DR. WILBUR K. THOMAS — Philadelphia, Pa.
Executive Secretary, American Friends Service Committee.

DEAN W. F. TILLETT — Nashville, Tenn.
Dean, Theological School, Vanderbilt University.

REV. WORTH M. TIPPY, D.D. — New York, N. Y.
Associate Secretary, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

REV. W. R. WEDDERSPOON, D.D. — Chicago, Ill.
Pastor, Methodist Episcopal Church.

REV. GEORGE U. WENNER, D.D. — Brooklyn, N. Y.
Pastor, Lutheran Church.

MR. GEORGE W. WICKERSHAM — New York, N. Y.
Attorney-at-Law. Formerly Attorney General, United States. President, League of Nations Non-Partisan Association.

MRS. FRANK F. WILLIAMS — Buffalo, N. Y.
Member, Women's Peace Party and League of Women Voters.

DR. TALCOTT WILLIAMS — New York, N. Y.
School of Journalism, Columbia University.

REV. C. B. WILMER, D.D. — Atlanta, Ga.
Rector, St. Mark's Episcopal Church.

REV. CORNELIUS WOELFKIN, D.D. — New York, N. Y.
Pastor, Fifth Avenue Baptist Church.

REV. CHARLES WOOD, D.D. — Washington, D. C.
Pastor, Presbyterian Church.

PRES. MARY E. WOOLLEY — South Hadley, Mass.
President, Mt. Holyoke College.

REV. C. R. ZAHNISER, PH.D. — Pittsburgh, Pa.
Secretary, Pittsburgh Federation of Churches.

Printed in the United States of America

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
CALIFORNIA
A5698

JX
1937
L8

Lynch, Frederick Henry, 1867- *ed.*

Mobilising for peace; addresses delivered at the Co
on America and the Permanent court of international j
edited by Frederick Lynch ... New York, Chicago
Fleming H. Revell company ,°1924,

1 p. l., 7-324 p. 19cm.

"Read at the Congress on America and the Permanent court o
national justice, called by the World alliance for international
ship through the churches, November 13-15, 1923, at Philadelp
Foreword

1. Peace. 2. Hague. Permanent court of international justic
World alliance for promoting international friendship throu
churches. II. Title.

CCSC/ehw

Library of Congress X1937.L8

A5698.